

Appendix

"Chances Are Growing for Medical Aid Plan Under Social Security," Wall Street Journal Staff Reporter Asserts in Comprehensive News Article—Senator Randolph Calls for Bold and Courageous Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I was intrigued by this headline in the Wall Street Journal today: "Care for the Aged: Chances Are Growing for Medical Aid Plan Under Social Security; Election Year Pressure Will Help 1962 Prospects—Cost Worry May Limit Benefits—Local Polls Sway Lawmakers."

The news article by John A. Grimes, staff reporter of the Wall Street Journal, under that headline is encouraging to those of us who support the principle of medical care for the aged under the social security system.

I hope the quotation included in the story, "It is no longer a question of whether; it is when," is an accurate appraisal of sentiment in the Congress favorable to prepaid medical care benefits for our senior citizens through the social security system. When? My answer is that enactment of legislation on this subject cannot come too soon, and hopefully during the life of this 87th Congress.

In West Virginia, I have campaigned consistently on the affirmative side of this issue and I know from my many contacts with the people at the grassroots and from the volume of my correspondence on the subject that a preponderant number of our citizens of all ages support the affirmative viewpoint. There is a real desire that a start be made on the establishment of a plan embracing the principle of paying in the productive years for medical care which few will escape needing in their periods of retirement.

Senator KERR and other members of the Senate Finance Committee gave painstaking attention to this problem. I believe, as I stated during debate on care for the aged, that the esteemed senior Senator from Oklahoma deserved commendation for his sincere efforts in the formulation of a plan. That program enacted into law during the 86th Congress should be supplemented. If we embrace the broadest social security formula a merited advance will be achieved.

I am not wedded to any thought that the initial approach to bringing medical

care for the aged under social security must be an all-benefits-included plan, because I know the system will have to be evolved on a relatively gradual basis in order to be fiscally sound and administratively feasible. Nevertheless, even the first step must be a bold and courageous one.

At every opportunity in the 86th Congress and again in this 87th Congress, I have taken and will continue to take advantage of every appropriate occasion to express my support for the principle that medical care for the aged should be made a part of social security.

In this connection, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement I made before the House Ways and Means Committee on August 2, 1961, in favor of pending legislation on the subject.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR JENNINGS RANDOLPH, OF WEST VIRGINIA, TO THE HOUSE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE, IN SUPPORT OF LEGISLATION TO EXPAND SOCIAL SECURITY TO PROVIDE MEDICAL CARE FOR THE AGED, WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 2, 1961

Mr. Chairman, I am most appreciative of the opportunity afforded by this committee to present my views in support of proposed legislation which would expand the social security program to provide medical care for the aged on a prepaid insurance basis to supplement the medical assistance for the needy aged provisions of Public Law 86-778.

West Virginia was one of the first States to enact legislation to enable it to participate in the health care program for needy aged under Public Law 86-778. The initial action taken in our State was the enactment of necessary legislation by the West Virginia Legislature in an October 1960 extraordinary session called for that purpose.

Ours was perhaps not the only State which entered into the program on what was then believed to be a temporary expedient basis on the assumption that Congress would pass a more substantial and more meaningful measure under social security tax financing. In a sense, West Virginia now is being penalized for this early action in behalf of those of its aged citizens who qualify under the Federal-State program authorized by Public Law 86-778 and our State law which implemented it.

The failure of Congress to move ahead with and provide social security coverage for medical care purposes has already necessitated in West Virginia the development of plans for a cutback in the existing program of medical services for the needy aged. And if the proposals for social security expansion are delayed beyond this year it is estimated that West Virginia's share of the cost of the limited needy aged care plan will advance to between \$10 million and \$12 million.

In a recent cogent article on the medical care-for-the-aged problem in West Virginia, a well-informed writer for the Charleston Gazette wrote:

"Without passage of the administration proposal for expanded social security coverage to include medical care for the aged,

which would shift financing to social security from general revenue, this State will be hard pressed to meet its aged care obligations in the year ahead. . . . Medical care for the aged cannot long be supported by direct taxation. Social security, under which the individual would pay for his care in unproductive years while he is still productive, is the only solution for financing on a permanent basis.

"When the present program of medical assistance for the needy aged was passed last October 1960, the financing plan adopted was a temporary expedient. The Governor recommended a shift of funds from other purposes to carry the program until March of this year, and the legislature acquiesced.

"The 6-month plan was calculated to coincide with action in Washington on the social security proposal. It was anticipated that the shift from general taxation to social security would be made within 2 months after Congress convened in January.

"When it was realized early this year that the social security measure was in trouble, the West Virginia Legislature decided to continue the program in the old form until January of next year. Aged care as a public service had been so slow getting off the ground that much of what was appropriated in October 1961 was still available when the legislature faced the problem anew in February.

"With this backlog of funds, plus an additional appropriation of \$1,325,256, it was believed that West Virginia would have enough money for its needy aged medical care program to last through December, with the Federal Government paying 70 percent of the program's costs.

"But the situation has changed radically since the legislature went home in March. Medical care costs have skyrocketed. Where they were running at \$153,867 when the legislative decision on anticipated needs was made in February, they were running at \$391,859 last month, June.

"State Welfare Director W. Bernard Smith is indeed worried. There is no longer any cushion to carry the program past December 31, as there was last March. As conditions stand, Smith either has the choice of stopping the program before the legislature returns again to appropriate more money or of curtailing services. Chances are he will order a cutback in services very soon. He and his staff are now studying ways to reduce services without wrecking the program.

"And what does the future hold after next January? In event the social security program is again sidetracked, it is believed that West Virginia's share of the cost of needy aged care will run to \$10 or \$12 million annually.

"This is a shocking prospect when one realizes that the next legislature has nowhere to look for so much money without going through the painful process of re-vamping the entire tax structure after having already done so during the last regular session before adjourning in March."

That is the picture confronting the officials and the citizens of West Virginia.

Mr. Chairman, those of us who support the social security concept of medical care for the aged do not deny the value of Public Law 86-778. But many of us have acknowledged its value as a supplement to, rather than a substitute for social security financ-

ing. As a general measure, Public Law 86-778 fails to provide the soundest financing and it adds an inordinate load to the already overburdened States, and it falls far short of offering adequate medical care for the needy aged, including the great majority of elderly persons who are unable to finance their health care under the impact of constantly mounting costs.

The inadequacy of the present law and its heavy impact on States through matching requirements are attested to by the small number of States which have programs in effect and the few which have elected to participate in its benefits this year. This record of achievement is inadequate to the needs of one of the most urgent social and humanitarian problems of our day.

Neither logic nor experience, neither social justice nor economic prudence can justify the resistance to social security financing of aged health care, which would allow men and women to pay for their later medical needs during the most productive years of their working lives. This program is opposed on the grounds of dogma rather than experience, and it is attacked by scare slogans rather than reason.

We are informed, too, that during the 6 months after Public Law 86-778 went into effect on October 1, 1960, Federal matching payments to the States for old-age assistance and medical care increased by \$44.5 million. This has enabled some States to decrease their spending for old-age assistance, to be sure, but when the number of States fully participating in Public Law 86-778 increases materially, I am certain the result will be that both Federal participation and State expenditures will mount rapidly.

This situation, developing at a time when the demands upon general revenues at both the Federal and State levels are on the increase, must be rectified—and this can best be done by turning to the social security method of financing medical care for the aged and by increasing the social security tax for this purpose.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent also that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the news article published in today's issue of the Wall Street Journal to which I made reference.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CARE FOR THE AGED; CHANCES ARE GROWING FOR MEDICAL AID PLAN UNDER SOCIAL SECURITY—ELECTION YEAR PRESSURE WILL HELP 1962 PROSPECTS; COST WORRY MAY LIMIT BENEFITS—LOCAL POLLS SWAY LAWMAKERS

(By John A. Grimes)

WASHINGTON.—Chances are growing that Congress next year will approve the hotly controversial plan for medical care for the aged via social security.

Passage, if it comes, will not be easy. Because of the cost, backers may have to settle for a cut-down version of President Kennedy's present scheme to pay hospital, nursing home, and other bills for 14 million Americans aged 65 or more.

But the belief is growing among foes as well as friends of the plan that it is destined for congressional approval in some form. A hard-core opponent of the proposal, sensing the trend in capital sentiment, concludes: "It's no longer a question of whether; it's when." Adds another foe: "There's just too much pressure for Congress to hold out against."

Almost as soon as the legislators return to town next January, they'll be greeted by an election-year concert of demands for new health help. Many of the folks 65 or over will make themselves heard; even in the present lull, says one Congressman, "there's

enough mail trickling in to remind you that they're watching." Labor's lobbyists will turn on a flood of letters from union members and their families. State Governors tussling with budget problems will prod lawmakers for social security financing; this might ease the States' burdens under medical care programs they now partly finance. And President Kennedy's legislative strategists, who have deliberately refrained from pressing the health issues to any showdown this year, will turn on real heat.

COST AND COMPULSION

All this pressure is now expected to overcome stony resistance among conservatives who object to the cost and compulsory aspect of social security financing, and among doctors who see a step toward socialized medicine.

Administration lobbyists are concentrating their fire on the House Ways and Means Committee, where a medical care bill must start its trip through the legislative mill and where the opposition has been tough. "We've changed some votes," asserts a key lobbyist, "though I don't know for sure that we've changed enough."

More particularly, Kennedy aids are trying to win over Committee Chairman MILLS, an Arkansas Democrat who not only voted against a social security health bill last year but helped author the Federal-State cost-sharing program that Congress enacted instead. "If we can get MILLS, we've automatically got the votes we need," figures one tactician. Officials are confident the issue can be negotiated with Mr. MILLS, even if it means cutting down the benefits in the President's plan for the sake of establishing a principle.

It's too soon to tell if any special pressure will be applied, but Kennedy men will at least appeal to the Congressman's sense of party responsibility, working through such administration supporters on the committee as Louisiana's Representative Boggs.

ADDED AMMUNITION

As added ammunition, White House lobbyists are counting heavily on arguments that the Federal-State plan adopted last year is proving inadequate to meet old folks' health needs. In the first 6 months of the law's operation, reports Assistant Health Education, Welfare Secretary Cohen, only a few more than 10,000 new ailing elderly people received State medical help. States are moving very slowly, HEW officials contend, to pick up their part of the burden.

"A lot of Congressmen went home last year thinking they'd taken care of the oldsters' medical problems, and found themselves still on the spot," remarks a key congressional staff man. "Now, some of them are almost eager to vote for the social security plan."

As an indicator of the support for the social security health plan, some lawmakers from supposedly conservative districts are getting some surprising results in polls of the home folks.

Republican Representative WIDNALL of New Jersey, expressing astonishment at a 20-percent response to 60,000 general questionnaires mailed out, reports a 62.5-percent yes vote for the proposal. Pennsylvania's GOP Representative SCHNEEBELI reports a 59-percent vote in favor of the social security approach. And a poll by Republican Representative HOSMER, of California, while finding constituents opposed to Federal aid for teachers' salaries and thought labor needed more regulation, simultaneously came up with a 53-percent yes response on the social security question.

BETTER MOBILIZATION?

By next year, the supporters may be better mobilized than ever. Retired Democratic Congressman Forand, of Rhode Island, who helped father the plan for medical

benefits under social security, has just announced formation of a National Council of Senior Citizens for Health Care Through Social Security, with headquarters on Capitol Hill, as a lobby to work for the goal its name specifies.

The present stealthy advance of this proposed boom for the elderly marks a comeback from seeming disaster. Last summer, amid the heat of Presidential politicking, both the Senate and the House fought off all efforts—Candidate Kennedy's included—to shoehorn a health schedule into the social security law. This year, despite the President's placement of the plan high on his legislative "must" list, Congress has gone no further than to hold 2 weeks of hearings on it.

Even apart from any socialized-medicine danger, there's genuine apprehension among many lawmakers as to where this new plunge might take the social security system in the long run.

"Anything we okay along this line will be just a foot in the door," frets a key Ways and Means Committee member. "It could end up costing more billions than anyone has been talking about." Another influential Congressman worries that social security tax increases necessary to pay for possible expansions of a health-care program, along with other tax boosts already scheduled, would bring a revolt by the public against the whole social security system.

The Congressmen who are worrying about even the early costs of a health plan under social security note that the administration already has been having trouble with its cost estimates. Administration officials have conceded that their first figures on the cost of nursing-home care were too low.

Leonard Larson, president of the American Medical Association, labels Mr. Kennedy's plan "unpredictably but extremely expensive." J. Douglas Colman, speaking for the Blue Cross private health insurance plans, contends the administration's cost estimates are "hazardously low" for all but the first year or two of operation.

Next year's battle over health care for the aged will revolve, initially at least, around the administration's plan now hanging fire in the House Ways and Means Committee. This calls for payment, out of a special social security account, of certain health bills for any or all of 14.2 million persons aged 65 and over who now are eligible for social security pensions—whether they need the help or not. The benefits: Up to 90 days of hospital care for one illness, after an out-of-pocket cost to the patient of \$20 to \$90; 180 days of skilled nursing-home care for one illness; 240 home health service visits a year; and hospital out-patient expenses that amount to more than \$20 apiece. Cost of the package, by administration estimates, would be \$1.1 billion in the first full year of operation, rising to \$2.6 billion by the year 2000.

TWO-WAY TAX BOOST

To collect the necessary funds, the administration proposes a two-way increase in social security taxes paid by workers and their bosses. First, the maximum amount of each worker's taxable wages would be increased to \$5,200 a year from the present \$4,800. In addition, the tax rate would be boosted by one-quarter of a percentage point each on employer and employee; the present rate is 3 percent apiece. This would pluck an additional maximum of \$13 a year from the paycheck of a worker now covered by social security, and a like amount from his employer's cash register. This increase would be piled atop already scheduled tax boosts which would take the top annual social security paycheck bite from \$144 each for a worker and his employer now to \$222 starting in 1968.

By comparison, what Mr. MILLS fashioned last year, with the help of Oklahoma's Senator KERR, was a program to fatten Federal public-assistance payments to the States; the increase was earmarked for medical benefits for needy old people. As envisioned by its authors, the plan could be stretched to cover as many as 12 million of the nearly 17 million persons aged 65 and over, whether they are on social security rolls or not.

First, Uncle Sam agreed to put up 50 percent to 80 percent of an added \$12 a month—a sum raised just this year by Congress to \$15—for increased medical benefits to be made available to some 2.4 million Americans already getting Federal-State old-age assistance; the top payment in which the United States will share now stands at \$80 a month per individual. Second, under a new medical assistance program the Government undertook to shoulder 50 percent to 80 percent of the cost of certain health benefits offered by the States to as many as 10 million more senior citizens who, though not on public assistance, might find the cost of an illness more than they could afford. The total Federal bill, it was estimated, might climb as high as \$165 million in the first full year that all States had some sort of plan working.

CLAIMS AND CHARGES

Though the Kerr-Mills plan is less than a year old, its performance to date has already brought both claims of success and charges of failure.

The American Medical Association, which sees the evil of socialized medicine lurking in the administration proposal, insists that the record of State participation so far is "remarkable proof" that the Kerr-Mills plan is working. The doctors' group, along with other opponents of the social security plan, insists the 1960 law in combination with the spread of private health insurance plans will take care of the problem by reaching the old people who really need medical help.

HEW officials take a less hopeful view. Their calculations show that about half the 43 States already offering medical help to old-age assistance recipients have taken legislative steps to improve these programs, and three States have started giving such aid to needy old-age assistance beneficiaries for the first time. But State adoption of the other half of the Kerr-Mills plan is moving more slowly. As of mid-August, HEW statisticians reported that 14 States were operating, in some form, medical-assistance plans for the aged not on old-age assistance roles; eight more States have adopted the necessary legislation and hope to have a program working by next year; and another eight States have legislation pending or have enacted a program but no funds for it. Action on plans in 19 more States "is not anticipated," HEW officials claim.

DRUGS AND DENTURES

Furthermore, they add, many State plans fall far short of the glowing list of benefits set forth in the law as eligible for Federal matching funds; these range from full hospital services down through doctor and dentist bills and the cost of doctor-prescribed drugs and dentures. One example cited: Kentucky limits hospital stays to 6 days, has a two-call limit on physicians' services, and a ceiling of \$48 a year on dentist bills covered. HEW Secretary Ribicoff complains unequal treatment from State to State is "not fair to the elderly."

Mr. Ribicoff warns, too, of a "fantastic drain" on hard-pressed State treasuries if the present plan ever is broadened to cover the major share of medical costs for the aged. He forecasts a possible \$1 billion-a-year price tag, with the States having to pay just under half of this.

Declares a report by the special Senate Subcommittee on Problems of the Aged, headed by Democratic Senator McNAMARA, of Michigan, an ardent backer of Social Security

financing: "The States already are experiencing difficulty in financing other essential programs. . . . The danger emerges therefore that the economic burden of the medical assistance for the aged program will tend to restrict the scope of benefits and the aged population to be covered, and thus fail to meet the long-range legislative intent of the program."

Added to all this pressure on Congress is the steady growth in the number of old folks, many of them demanding help with medical bills. Since 1950, the 65-and-over population has climbed by nearly 4.5 million to around 17 million; by 1970, it's expected to top 20 million. More and more, Congressmen report, the elderly have become a formidable political bloc.

Climbing medical costs are also keeping the health issue hot. This past June, the medical care category of the Government's consumer price index stood at 168.8 percent of the 1947-49 average, 3.9 percent above the level of a year earlier and far over the 105.4 percent reading for June 1950. In the same 10-year period, the total cost of living index rose from 101.8 percent of the 1947-49 average to 127.6 percent.

George Whelan Anderson, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, on August 1, the great Borough of Brooklyn in the city of New York was accorded a signal honor by our President in the appointment of one of her native sons to a high position in the defense forces of the Nation. On June 22, 1961, President John F. Kennedy announced the nomination of Vice Admiral Anderson as Chief of Naval Operations. He succeeded Adm. Arleigh Burke in that position on August 1, 1961.

George Whelan Anderson, Jr., was born on December 15, 1906, in Brooklyn, N.Y., son of George W. and Clara (Green) Anderson. He attended Brooklyn Preparatory School, and entered the U.S. Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md., from his native State in 1923. Graduated and commissioned ensign on June 2, 1927, he subsequently advanced in rank to that of rear admiral, to date from August 1, 1954. He served in the rank of vice admiral from May 1, 1957, until January 18, 1958, and on September 14, 1959, he again assumed the rank of vice admiral.

Following graduation from the Naval Academy in 1927, he remained there for the short course in aviation, before reporting to the U.S.S. *Cincinnati*, on which he served as a junior officer until 1930. He was then ordered to the Naval Air Station, Pensacola, Fla., for flight training and, designated naval aviator in October of that year, was ordered to the Atlantic Fleet for duty in the aviation units of the U.S.S. *Concord* and U.S.S. *Raleigh*, successively.

Between 1933 and 1935 he was assigned to the flight test division of the Naval Air Station, NOB, Norfolk, Va., after which he had duty afloat with Fighting Squadron 2, based on the U.S.S.

Lexington. He was detached from that squadron with orders to the Newport News (Va.) Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co., where the U.S.S. *Yorktown* was building, and joined that aircraft carrier on her commissioning on September 30, 1937. From the fall of 1939 until early 1940 he was attached to Patrol Squadron 44, Patrol Wing 4, based at Seattle, Wash.

He was next assigned to the plans division, Bureau of Aeronautics, Navy Department, Washington, D.C., and while there participated in the formulation of the American aircraft program for World War II. This included association with wartime agencies charged with production and allocation of all U.S. aircraft, and planning the aircraft aspects of the expansion of naval aviation. For his liaison work with the Army Air Force while in that assignment, he received a letter of commendation from the War Department, with authorization to wear the Army commendation ribbon.

In March 1943 he again reported to the Newport News Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co., this time to assist in fitting out the new U.S.S. *Yorktown*—CV-10—and became navigator and tactical officer when she was commissioned on April 15, 1943. He was aboard that aircraft carrier during her early action in the Pacific, and received a letter of commendation, with authority to wear the commendation ribbon, from the commander in chief, U.S. Pacific Fleet, for outstanding services from August 15 to November 1, 1943, while attached to the U.S.S. *Yorktown*.

He is also entitled to the ribbon for, and a facsimile of the Presidential Unit Citation awarded the U.S.S. *Yorktown* for "extraordinary heroism in action against enemy Japanese forces in the air, at sea and on shore in the Pacific war area from August 31, 1943, to August 15, 1945."

He next had duty as plans officer on the staff of commander aircraft, U.S. Pacific Fleet, and for "exceptionally meritorious conduct as head of the plans division of the staff of commander, Air Force, U.S. Pacific Fleet during the period from November 1943 to March 1944" he was awarded the Legion of Merit.

On March 28, 1944, he reported as assistant to the deputy commander in chief, U.S. Pacific Fleet and Pacific Ocean areas. He was awarded the Bronze Star Medal for "meritorious achievement—in that capacity—during operations against enemy Japanese forces in the Pacific war area, from March 28, 1944, to April 16, 1945."

In June 1945, he became aviation officer in the strategic plans section on the staff of the commander in chief, U.S. Fleet, with headquarters at the Navy Department, Washington, D.C. As such he also had duty as Deputy Navy Planner on the Joint Planning Staff. Ordered to the Office of the Chief of Naval Operations, Navy Department, he was appointed a member of the Permanent Joint Board on Defense—Canada-United States—in November 1946; was also one of the Navy members of the Brazilian-United States Defense Commission and served with the Joint War Plans Committee of the Joint Staff.

In July 1948 he returned to sea as commanding officer of the U.S.S. *Mindoro*, and when detached from that anti-submarine carrier in August 1948, reported for instruction at the National War College, Washington, D.C. Completing the course there in July 1950, he joined the staff of the commander, 6th Fleet, as fleet operations officer. In December 1950 he transferred to the staff of the Supreme Allied Commander in Europe—SHAPE—and remained there until July 1952 as the senior U.S. officer in plans and operations. He served as commanding officer of the U.S.S. *Franklin D. Roosevelt* for a year, and when detached from command of that aircraft carrier in June 1953, reported for duty in the Office of the Chief of Naval Operations, Navy Department.

In July 1953 he became special assistant to the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Washington, D.C., continuing to serve in that capacity until July 1955. On August 3, that year, he assumed command of the Formosa Patrol Force with additional duty as commander, Fleet Air Wing 1—his title was changed late in 1955 to commander, U.S. Taiwan Patrol Force. He was Chief of Staff, Joint Staff, commander in chief, Pacific, from July 1956 until May 1957, when he reported in the rank of vice admiral as chief of staff and aide to the commander in chief, Pacific. He was commander, Carrier Division 6, from July 1958 until September 14, 1959, when he became commander, 6th Fleet, and commander, naval striking and support forces, southern Europe, with the accompanying rank of vice admiral.

In addition to the Legion of Merit, the Bronze Star Medal, the Commendation Ribbon—Navy—the Commendation Ribbon—Army—and the Presidential Unit Citation Ribbon with one star, Admiral Anderson has the American Defense Service Medal; the American Campaign Medal; the Asiatic-Pacific Campaign Medal with two stars; the World War II Victory Medal; and the National Defense Service Medal. He has also been awarded the Order of the British Empire, rank of honorary officer, from the Government of Great Britain.

Admiral Anderson's official address is Brooklyn, N.Y., but he makes his home in Washington, D.C. He is married to the former May Lee Lamar Sample, of Pensacola, Fla., and has two sons, Lt. George W. Anderson III, U.S. Navy—class of 1957—and Thomas Patrick; a daughter, Mary Annette; and stepdaughter, Miss Carolyn Sample.

Hon. Eugene J. Keogh

SPEECH
OF

HON. ALBERT THOMAS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, permit me to join our colleagues in commending

Congressman EUGENE KEOGH, of New York, on his birthday.

It has been my privilege and pleasure to know and work with Congressman KEOGH through the last 25 years. He and I came to Congress the same day. All through this period we have been warm friends. By any yardstick of measurement Congressman KEOGH is one of the big, effective, and outstanding Members of Congress. His efforts for his district are always solid and effective; his advice on national matters is sought by many of us. I congratulate the people of his great district on their wisdom and good judgment in electing him continuously to represent them.

May Congressman KEOGH have many many more happy birthdays.

Wheat Price To Affect Bread Slice?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MAURINE B. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, consumers are naturally concerned when they read that bread prices may rise again soon. If such a rise does occur, who will be responsible? Would it be justified? What about the quality of our bread, and are we getting our money's and nutrition's worth even now? Mr. Julius Duschka of the Washington Post has written an analysis of the wheat-bread-price dilemma, which I commended to the attention of my colleagues. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHEAT PRICE BOOST NO CAUSE TO INCREASE THE COST OF BREAD

(By Julius Duschka, staff reporter)

Should consumers blame farmers for the proposed penny-a-pound increase in the price of bread?

And is it true that in these days of billion-bushel wheat surpluses there actually is a shortage of high-quality wheat which millers need for flour?

These two questions were raised last week when Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman conducted a long-distance argument with E. E. Kelley, Jr., president of the American Bakers Association.

DISPUTED INGREDIENTS

As most consumers stood by understandably puzzled, Freeman and Kelley disputed the ingredients which are responsible for an expected rise in bread prices.

The argument began when Kelley, who operates a large bakery in Lakeland, Fla., said that "it will be little short of a miracle if bread prices are not increased in the near future."

He cited an increase in wheat support prices and a shortage of high-quality wheat as among the factors calling for higher bread prices.

Kelley said increases in flour prices that bakers are already paying will add \$60 million a year to their operating costs. This

amounts to the baking industry's total profits last year, Kelley added.

He also said that a recent increase in Agriculture Department price-support levels for nonfat dry milk, an important commercial baking ingredient, added another \$8 million to the industry's annual costs.

Wheat support prices will go up next year under a new farm program passed by Congress this summer and approved by wheat producers just last week.

In exchange for a 10 percent reduction in wheat acreages, farmers will be guaranteed an average price of \$2 a bushel by the Government, compared with \$1.79 this year.

Farmers will also be paid for the land taken out of wheat production. The payments will vary from 45 to 60 percent of what the farmers could have earned if the diverted acres had been planted in wheat.

But this program will have no direct effect on the price of wheat harvested this year.

There has been no significant changes in the price of No. 2 Hard Red Winter wheat, which has been selling for about \$2 a bushel. This is the quality wheat that millers need for flour.

As for the supplies of this wheat, the Agriculture Department maintains that they are more than ample.

DROUGHT EFFECTS

The Hard Red Spring wheat crop, which millers also want, is estimated at only 128 million bushels this year, which is about 12 million below the domestic needs of 140 million bushels.

But there is a surplus of Hard Red Winter wheat of almost a billion bushels. In addition there is a stored surplus of nearly 200 million bushels of spring wheat.

The United States needs only 257 million bushels of the winter wheat. The shortage of spring wheat is due in part to the drought centering in Montana and North and South Dakota.

Not all of the surplus wheat is of high quality, but combined with the expected 1961 Hard Red Winter wheat crop of more than 1 billion bushels, it should furnish enough top-grade wheat to meet the needs of bakers.

The protein content of the 1961 crop is about 1 percent less than in 1960, but this year's wheat is considered equal to last year's in protein quality.

The farmer gets only 14 percent of what the consumer pays for a loaf of bread, and this figure includes the cost of the butter and milk in the bread as well as the wheat.

The Agriculture Department says that the average cost of a pound loaf of bread last year was 20.3 cents, of which the farmer gets 2.8 cents.

The share received by the baker and wholesaler, who usually are the same person or company, was 11.9 cents, or 59 percent of the total.

The retailer got 3.4 cents, or 17 percent, and the miller received seven-tenths of a cent, or 3 percent. Other costs amounted to 1.5 cents.

The farmer's share of the cost of a loaf of bread has decreased from 25 to 14 percent during the last decade, while the price of bread has increased from 13.5 cents a pound loaf to 20.3 cents.

The baker-wholesaler's share has gone up from 44 to 59 percent, the retailer's has remained the same at 17 percent and the miller's has decreased from 5 to 3 percent.

OTHER COST RISES

Not all of the costs are profit, of course. Labor costs, for example, have been continually increasing, as have other costs involved in production and distribution of bread.

But where do all of these figures leave the consumer, except holding a bag containing a higher priced loaf of bread?

The figures would seem to indicate that neither a greater return for the farmer nor a shortage of quality wheat is responsible for the projected price increase.

Hingham Naval Ammunition Depot Should Be Reopened and Reactivated To Prevent Another "Pearl Harbor"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 14, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from Kenneth T. Lyons, national president of the Federal Employees Veterans' Association in Boston, and a statement in support of reactivating the Hingham Naval Ammunition Depot at Hingham, Mass.:

NATIONAL FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

VETERANS' ASSOCIATION, INC.,

Boston, Mass., August 29, 1961.

Hon. THOMAS J. LANE,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LANE: The enclosed brief relative to a request for the reactivation of the Hingham Naval Ammunition Depot, together with portions of a letter that was submitted to naval activities concerning a shortage of conventional ammunition as it pertains to the Navy's worldwide supply, is cause for alarm and demands that the Defense Department immediately review the present status and future of the Hingham Ammunition Depot's importance as it pertains to our national defense.

The enclosed brief is based on facts derived from congressional sources and Navy records.

It is hoped that your office will seek immediate action on the part of the Navy Department and/or Department of Defense to speed the reactivation of the much-needed ammunition depot in Hingham, Mass.

Thank you for your cooperation, I am,
Very sincerely yours,

KENNETH T. LYONS,
National President.

STATEMENT OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES VETERANS ASSOCIATION, 10 TREMONT STREET, BOSTON, MASS., AUGUST 29, 1961

A demand that Congress act to reopen and reactivate the Hingham Naval Ammunition Depot in order to prevent another Pearl Harbor to our naval fleets operating in the North Atlantic, was made known today by Kenneth T. Lyons, national president of the Federal Employees Veterans Association in a lengthy brief that was submitted to the Massachusetts congressional delegation and to the Armed Services Committee of both the U.S. Senate and the U.S. House of Representatives.

Lyons stated today that "We have not time to lose and the situation is quite serious. The Hingham Naval Ammunition Depot must be reopened and reactivated in order to prevent another Pearl Harbor to our naval fleet as the rapidly expanding North Atlantic Fleet is without an ammunition depot in the northern waters extending from New York to Canada. As serious as this threat may be, the Navy's present worldwide conventional ammunition shortage makes it mandatory that the Hingham Depot be placed on a full production capacity."

Lyons is backing up his disclosures that the Navy was short on conventional ammunition revealed the fact that the Navy's commanding officer of the U.S. Naval Ammunition Depot in Crane, Ind., notified all fleet units on March 16, 1961, and again on June 5, 1961, that 190 different types of conventional ammunition items were in limited supply. The items that are in a limited supply, according to the commanding officer refers to the stock status of convention items on a Navy worldwide basis. Some of the items that are in a limited supply include various types of hand grenades: 3-inch by 50-inch shells, 500-pound bombs, 2,000-pound bombs, rockets and certain types of fuses.

Navy fleets sailing to Boston, Newport, and Portsmouth for overhaul without any missiles or ammunition on board constitutes a calculated risk and an inability to meet conditions that might well arise. Whether the Navy should accept this risk should be given serious attention and a strong consideration for reopening the facility at Hingham.

Ships at sea without ammunition or missiles constitute a dangerous risk to our national security in a time of perilous peace.

The Hingham Ammunition Depot was one of the most efficient installations in the naval complex of ammunition depots. This was not a consideration in determining the specific installation to be closed. The depot had a perfect record of achievement never experiencing a disaster or explosion since its inception in 1904.

The plea for the retention and reactivation of the Hingham Naval Ammunition Depot will not in any way interfere with Senator BENJAMIN A. SMITH's proposal for the NASA Apollo site being located at Hingham, for it is our earnest and factual view that the Navy and/or Department of Defense need only to reopen the back river section of Hingham to take care of the Navy's needs. There is adequate land, supplies, storage facilities and buildings available for the NASA site and ammunition depot at Hingham.

For our Congress, our Navy, and our Defense Department, to ignore this plea could within the near future prove disastrous to the safety of New England and the overall defense of our east coast.

The 100th Infantry Division

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THRUSTON B. MORTON

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, when the Defense Department launched our Nation's largest military buildup since the Korean war, the Commonwealth of Kentucky was extremely proud to provide the cornerstone in the training of thousands of young fighting men under the emergency mobilization program.

In recalling the "Centurymen" of the 100th Infantry Division to active duty, the Military Establishment paid high tribute and honor not only to the excellence and proficiency of the division but also to the traditions of high patriotism and sacrifice which Kentucky has always displayed in the face of national adversity.

The 100th Division, a unit in the U.S. Army Reserve, consists of 5 regiments

whose rosters number approximately 3,000 men in 44 Kentucky communities. The "Centurymen" will report for duty on September 26 at Fort Polk, La. Its primary mission will be to establish an Army Training Center at Fort Polk in order to expand the mobilization training base of the Army.

In addition to the 100th Division, the Defense Department also called up the 304th Military Police Unit—USAR—Bardstown, and two National Guard outfits, the 413th Ordnance Company, Frankfort, and the 3d Medium Tank Battalion, Bowling Green. All reporting October 1, the ordnance company will go to Fort Benning, Ga., the military policemen to Fort Hood, Tex., and the tankers to Fort Knox, Ky.

The makeup of the Century Division reflects a complete cross section of life in Kentucky. Its members include bankers, college educators, attorneys, truckers, clerks, farmers, grocers, and right on down the line. Kentucky fighting men have always been in the forefront when duty called. They have never hesitated to take up arms during crises. Kentuckians spearheaded the advancement of our Nation westward beyond the Alleghenies, and have served with distinction and heroism in every conflict involving our Nation.

It is interesting to note that during the Civil War, Kentucky oversubscribed its quotas for service in both the Union and Confederate Armies. It is also interesting that of the recent order calling up some 76,000 reservists and National Guardsmen, Kentucky will provide about 3,500 men or approximately 4.5 percent of the total. Populationwise, Kentucky provides less than 2 percent of the national population.

Undoubtedly, the dislocations of active duty will impose hardship on many members of the 100th Division and their families. The sacrifices which these citizen-soldiers have been called on to make will be felt in innumerable ways in their home communities.

The attitude of the 100th Division is best summed up by its commander, Maj. Gen. Dillman Rash, who commented, "This job is one we have been training for, and we are going to give them a crackerjack show."

The Century Division, which saw 163 days of frontline action in France and Germany during World War II and shattered two centuries of military history by capturing the stronghold city of Bitch, has been called up for 1 year. It has spent several years becoming a training organization, and it is to this mission that it is now assigned.

The excellence of the 100th Division's training capabilities is exemplified by the fact that it is the only one of 13 full training divisions called to duty at this time. In short, the Division is the best one qualified to do the job.

Secretary of the Army Elvis J. Stahr, Jr., himself a Kentuckian, has written to each member of the Kentucky congressional delegation explaining the reasons why the 100th Division was called to active duty. I ask unanimous consent that Secretary Stahr's letter to me

be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
Washington, August 28, 1961.

HON. THRUSTON B. MORTON,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR MORTON: The following information concerning the selection of the 100th Division (Training) for mobilization and subsequent stationing at Fort Polk, La., for the purpose of establishing an Army training center to expand the mobilization training base for the Army is being provided to you and the other members of the Kentucky delegation in the hope that it will be of assistance.

The selection of the 100th Division (Training) for mobilization was determined by the Department of the Army in coordination with the Commanding General, U.S. Continental Army Command.

The following basic criteria were utilized in arriving at this decision:

(a) The unit's reasonable geographical proximity to Fort Polk.

(b) The readiness of the division is considered higher than other training divisions located within a reasonable distance of the training site.

(c) The assigned strength is high.

(d) The division has actually conducted highly satisfactory training center instruction for the past 3 years during annual active duty for training at Fort Knox, Ky.

(e) The annual evaluation of this division during summer training has consistently reflected a high state of readiness.

Sincerely yours,

ELVIS J. STAHR, Jr.,
Secretary of the Army.

House Resolution 211—Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. This measure is now House Resolution 211. There are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place then on the subject of the captive nations—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 8, 1961, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286-3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211 has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vi-

tal contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I include the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 211 in the Appendix of the RECORD:

COMPTON, CALIF.,
August 14, 1961.

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Should like very much to see some favorable action on your bill, House Resolution 211. A Special House Committee on Captive Nations, it seems to me, could do a tremendous amount of good. Do hope it gets lots of support.

Sincerely,

Mrs. BLANCHE BRILL.

AUGUST 22, 1961.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Enclosed is a clipping from Draugas reproducing the Lithuanian News Agency's ELTA (anti-Communist) statement on Soviet reaction to the Captive Nations Week.

The statement says that Radio Vilnius on July 22 had broadcast that the week had been organized by the most reactionary circles, including the "remnants of bourgeois-nationalists who managed to escape beyond the ocean." They still are embracing the idea of restoration of capitalist system in the countries of "people's democracy."

A certain Morkuckis, a returnee from Argentina, was chosen to make known a Soviet people's opinion. He categorically asserted that neither the U.S. reactionaries nor Lithuanian bourgeois-nationalists would ever see capitalist system restored in Lithuania. This was followed by denunciation of living and working conditions in capitalist countries and praise of the same conditions in "people's democracies."

Evidently, all this was a monitored program of Radio Vilnius. Such programs are monitored in Western Germany. They used to be evaluated and classified at the Library of Congress, but this has been discontinued because of lack of funds.

In the concluding part of the article, ELTA quotes Izvestia of July 19, speaking on the same subject. If needed, translation of the article could be secured through the Library of Congress.

Perhaps you could use above information as ammunition in your struggle for the Committee on Captive Nations. The fact remains that all references to captive nations are strongly resented in the Soviet Union. They are extremely sensitive on this matter. The committee would be a very good instrument of constant needling, and at the same time would serve as a reminder that the captive nations are not forgotten and written off. I wish you all the luck in this campaign.

Sincerely,

Dr. ALBERT N. TARULIS.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: I am highly in favor of House Resolution 211.

I am writing my Congressman urging him to ask for a Special House Committee on Captive Nations be formed at once.

Sincerely,

Mrs. R. R. SCHROEDER.
BAKERSFIELD, CALIF.

FREE WORLD COMMITTEE,
Chicago, Ill., August 12, 1961.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: We commend your introduction of House Resolution 211 to create a Special Committee on the Captive Nations of the enemy Red empire. The peace of the world depends on free world victory in world war III. We hope that this peace may be won by the peoples of now Communist-occupied lands before it becomes necessary for the United States to extend its military operations to the use of nuclear weapons.

Yours truly,

THOMAS H. LATIMER,
President.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: Your House Resolution 211 would be a good way to help captive nations.

Very truly yours,

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

ISABELLE CAGNEY.

AUGUST 14, 1961.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Enclosed are clippings of two articles that appeared in the American-Lithuanian daily, Draugas, published in Chicago. One appeared on July 29 and is based on my information that clarifies your role in the fight for the Committee on Captive Nations. The other is an editorial written by Draugas' people. It speaks of the Captive Nations Week and places particular emphasis on the July 24 commemoration in the House of Representatives; your address is highly praised. The same is true of your role in furthering House Resolution 211, to which the last part of the editorial is devoted.

Sincerely,

Dr. ALBERT N. TARULIS.

CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: Good luck on House Resolution 211.

J. LOELET.

BURBANK, CALIF.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: I heartily approve your bill to form a Special Committee on Captive Nations at once.

Mrs. GEO. McEBORY.

PASADENA, CALIF.

PALOS VERDES ESTATES, CALIF.,
August 15, 1961.

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: All Americans should be grateful to you for introducing House Resolution 211 in Congress. A Committee on Captive Nations could do much to give hope and courage to the millions who are now enslaved behind the Iron Curtain.

I am now reading "I Saw Poland Betrayed" written by our Ambassador to Poland at the end of World War II, and it is shocking to learn that the U.S. Government, gave the Polish Government, which was completely in the hands of the Soviets, the sum of \$90 million at a time when that same Government was arresting American citizens and our Ambassador was unable to ascertain where they were and was not allowed to see nor speak to them, and many of whom never did return from such imprisonment.

I hope that you will be successful in your effort to get House Resolution 211 passed, and am writing my Congressman today asking that he support this resolution.

Very truly yours,

G. S. SOULE.

AUGUST 17, 1961.

DEAR Mr. FLOOD: Your House Resolution 211, providing a Special House Committee on Captive Nations, will, if passed, give hope to millions of enslaved persons

throughout the world. I have written my Congressman to give it his support.

I hope Congress, at the close of this session, will decide to recess, not adjourn. I am told that in the latter case, only the President can reconvene it; if Congress merely recesses a single member can call it into action again.

Very truly yours,

Miss ABLIDA C. BALLAGH.
BAKERSFIELD, CALIF.

Fashion Editors and Singers for Padre Island, Too

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, Miss Loraine Daly, singer and author, is writing a book on the colorful and exciting history of Padre Island. The book tells of the area which my bill, S. 4, would make into a national seashore recreation area, for use for all the people.

Miss Daly's book, "The History of Padre Island," to be published in November, will deal with the history of the island from the year 1500 until the present. Miss Daly, who has made an intensive study of the island in research for her book, has said she favors passage of the bill to make Padre Island a national park.

My bill, S. 4, has been brought out of the Public Lands Subcommittee and placed before the full Senate Interior Committee. This is meaningful progress.

I request unanimous consent of the Senate to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an article concerning Miss Daly's forthcoming book on Padre Island, which appeared in the Dallas Morning News on Sunday, August 26, 1961, under the title, "Singer: Turns Author on Padre Island."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SINGER: TURNS AUTHOR ON PADRE ISLAND
(By Gay Simpson, fashion editor of the News)

Most Texas ambassadors of good will make headlines with the spoken word but a songstress from San Antonio charms to date with her singing voice and modeling. Soon her writing talents should add new devotees as she is doing her final editing on her book on Texas' Padre Island.

Loraine Daly, who will be at the Statler Hilton Hotel with the Ken Harris orchestra until September 2, calls herself a singer first and a glamour girl second. Daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Norman Weicklein, San Antonio, she finds German songs in her parents' native tongue are favorites with her audiences. She sings in talking register.

A graduate of the Incarnate Word College, she first studied seriously with the sisters.

"Six years ago I left San Antonio and wound up with my first TV and radio work in Dallas. Then after graduating as a fashion and photographic model from the House of Charm, in Sacramento, Calif., I taught there until I had finished a singing contract."

As a model for the Aluminum Co. of America, the statuesque Texan wore an aluminum swimsuit of golden Lurex threads. "To introduce this 100-percent aluminum fabric, entertainer Hildegarde also wore a formal gown which is now in the Museum of Science and Industry in Chicago.

The green-eyed beauty, whose measurements are 34-24-36, has as her favorite work clothes accordion-pleated nylon chiffon skirts "that fight back against wrinkles" and blouses of silk, velvet, or lace.

It was while Loraine was singing with the Nick Stuart orchestra that she met her husband, trumpeter Jerry Jolliffe. They were married on ABC's "Bride and Groom" show in Hollywood.

It was being chosen Miss Padre Island that inspired Loraine to write a book on the fascinating history of the island. She began studying its history and did most of her research from old newspaper files. She has followed its history from 1500 when it was a virgin wilderness to its development as a resort.

"This island that the Spanish explorers touched before the Pilgrims will be the Miami Beach of Texas. I get chill bumps when I think of how I love it with its rich history of pirates who hid their loot, the 52 ships buried in Devil's Elbow where five ocean currents meet, the island where Zachary Taylor moved his troops and where cattle lived in style with mahogany corrals.

"Your Frank Tolbert's expedition to find the lost city is included in 'The History of Padre Island' to be published in November by the Naylor Co. I'm hoping the bill before Congress to make Padre Island a national park goes through."

Miss Daly tries to keep her private life simple and casual.

"I don't want to cheat Jerry out of home life. When he finishes college, we hope to live on Padre Island where we have bought two lots. Since he is from a bookish family and is majoring in English and education, he'll probably teach. Besides keeping house, I'd like to have a TV woman's program."

Lotteries of West Germany and West Berlin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I should like to tell the Members of this House about the government lotteries of West Germany. There are two major regional lotteries in West Germany, and an additional one in West Berlin.

The total gross receipts of the German lotteries in 1960 amounted to about one quarter of a billion dollars. The net profit to the government in that year was close to \$50 million.

West Germany and West Berlin gather large revenues from these lotteries, and we would do well to profit from their example in these days when our financial resources are being taxed as never before to enable us to meet our defense requirements. Now, more than ever,

America needs a national lottery—especially if it is the only alternative to higher taxation.

Filling the Empty Seats

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 14, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the August 28, 1961, issue of the Christian Science Monitor:

FILLING THE EMPTY SEATS—AMERICA'S HUGE TRANSPORT NETWORK NEEDS TO BE SENSIBLY CONDENSED, WITH ITS BASIC COMPETITIVENESS PRESERVED

The greatest single transportation system in the world appears to be headed for trouble in several departments in a way that might be called typically American.

It is suffering from too much capacity.

It is unbalanced by too much fragmented competition.

It is partially frozen by the very Government regulation that was expected to keep it from becoming rigid under monopoly ownership—private or Government.

Despite the fact that the heavily used New Haven Railroad is now bankrupt, that busy Capital Airlines was consumed by deficits, that standing-room-only commuter travel is encountering discontinuances, that common-carrier trucks are being challenged by producer-owned trucks, and that the eastern railroads are in a gigantic battle to preserve their skins through mergers, the situation does not yet amount to a crisis. The Kennedy administration was probably wise to defer sending Congress its transportation crisis message this year.

But the lawmakers should be preparing to take action next session. For much public and private money, as well as travelers' and shippers' anguish, can be saved by moving ahead of crisis conditions.

The automobile is responsible for a good part of America's transportation overcapacity. While trains once carried some 83 percent of all passenger traffic, the individual car now carries 88 percent. And with an average of less than two persons per six-passenger car.

RAILROAD DEFICITS; MISSING PASSENGERS

Today Government provides rights-of-way for air, water, and road travel—three of the four major transport systems. The result is a rush of buses, trucks, barges, and planes to use the Government-built tracks.

But railroads have shrunk little in carrying capacity. So seats—and boxcars—are often empty.

Between 1946 and 1957 the passenger deficit of U.S. rail lines increased from \$139,776,000 to \$723,670,000. Only liberalized Federal regulations permitting abandonment of little used lines has let this drop back to \$485 million in 1960—still far too much red ink for the financial health of lines needing money for new equipment and better service.

It is estimated, furthermore, that freight operations are so far below capacity that an additional 75 percent could be handled.

Buses, which have been generally holding their own, have also had to contend with an uneconomic increase in empty seats.

Even the bustling, expanding airlines suffer from this problem. There has been

an increase in empty-seat-miles flown from 1,580,000 in 1946 to 16,642,000, in 1959.

For years some rail lines were able to keep their net income steady by deferring maintenance and replacement of equipment. But the chickens have begun to come home to roost.

FRANCHISE FOR THE VICIOUS CIRCLE ROUTE

In the Doyle transportation study group's comprehensive report to the Senate Commerce Committee this year note is made of how this process has become a vicious circle. With less freight traffic, the railroads have condensed service. Trains are then run on a tonnage basis rather than a schedule. They are longer. Yards cannot handle them easily. Delays increase. Business decreases further. Borrowing in financial markets costs the railroads more because they represent a greater financial risk.

Even some of the airlines are now on the borderline of what is called debt financing as compared with equity financing. The equity value of their planes and equipment does not cover their debts.

The higher cost of borrowing, of course, serves only to add to the problem of declining net income. (Railroad nets dropped 40 percent between 1955 and 1959.) This is a hard circle to break out of.

Obviously when the railroads in general—and eastern railroads in particular—are having such problems they are no longer the kind of monopolistic octopus that the Interstate Commerce Commission was originally designed to fight. Already some 150 trains have been discontinued, and 9,859 miles of track were abandoned between 1946 and 1959.

But in any solution of the present problem the railroads must remain a key ingredient. In the fields of long distance freight and short distance passenger commuting there are tasks that only the railroad, with its large capacity and unhindered rights-of-way, can perform well.

The Kennedy administration's deferred legislative program would take care of some of the immediate inequities. It reportedly would permit faster tax writeoffs on rail equipment. It would allow tax deferment on reserve funds if these were used within a reasonable period to purchase needed new equipment. It would seek to have State and local tax overloads on railroads reduced.

These are logical steps. They amount to a form of support that does not just subsidize the status quo but aids a sensible modernization.

SUBJECTS CONGRESS OUGHT TO ACT UPON

But in addition a much more far reaching—and delicate—legislative threshold must be crossed if the transportation system of the Nation is to continue an efficient evolution. Congress ought to be asked to take steps covering the following:

Mergers—The lawmakers should instruct the ICC to consider all current merger requests as a whole, making certain that each major region is served by strong, competing systems as a result of mergers. Quite understandably, current mergers tend to involve only matings of the strong and profitable with the strong and profitable. Weak links need to be integrated, too.

Joint routes and rates—Congress should make clear its intent that the ICC use its power to force rail, truck, air, and ship lines to give shippers rates for joint routes. Such a policy strictly enforced might begin to end the rivalries that force shippers to use only one medium of transport when good sense would demand that a shipment start, say, by rail and be transshipped by truck.

Common carriage—When a meatpacker buys his own fleet of delivery trucks and then begins to pick up orders of fruit in

them for the return run, private carriage begins to challenge the position of common carriage. Private carriage is not controlled under the strict rate and route decrees that the ICC imposes on common carriers. The result is that unregulated private truck use increased 350 percent between 1946 and 1959.

Common carriage is vital to the Nation's economic health. A balance between private and common carriage must be preserved. Therefore the administration's recommendation that private carriage be placed under some regulation makes sense—if only to assure that ballast runs charge going rates and don't cheat common carriers of business.

MORE VIGOR NEEDED IN RAIL MANAGERMENTS

Transportation companies—The logical next step beyond joint rates and routes is the formation of transportation companies, firms operating trains, trucks, buses, and barges. These would have to be as firmly policed by the ICC as the powerful railroads were early in the century. They should be allowed to coalesce only where fair competition in the public interest will clearly be preserved. But they seem inevitably a part of the future in an integrated America.

At present there would appear to be few firms ready for such crossbreeding. But Congress should consider instructing the ICC to give them a go-ahead on an experimental basis as soon as any applicant appears.

The Doyle Committee report recommends, wisely, that if such a go-ahead is given the combine be licensed for only 3 years. This would permit periodic review to make sure competition is preserved.

Many other steps need to be taken within the transport industry itself. Railroad management needs to be shaken into more vigorous salesmanship and active recruiting of young executives. Labor must cooperate in trimming out unneeded personnel. There is sense in suggestions that major lines set up an independent subsidiary management to deal exclusively with passenger service.

The experience of the North Western, which overhauled its Chicago commuter operation and is now making a profit, is encouraging. So is the determination of Erie-Lackawanna to do the same thing in New York.

Increases in population and business volume mean that the current overcapacity of American transportation will eventually disappear. But careful research as to the pattern of this growth, plus more forward-looking Government regulation, are needed to prevent the adjustment from being wasteful and costly.

General Federation of Women's Clubs Urges Action on Election Reforms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, as one who is very much interested in the need for changes in our electoral procedures, I am happy to note that the General Federation of Women's Clubs at their 1961 conference took a firm position on this very important issue. Commenting on a number of electoral problems, including disenfranchisement because of State and local residency requirements,

the Federation urged the establishment of a bipartisan committee to make a study and recommendations in order that we can develop modern, efficient and equitable campaigns and election procedures. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this resolution appear at the conclusion of my remarks.

The distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee, Senator KEFAUVER, and I recently introduced a Senate joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to liberalize residence requirements for voting in presidential elections. Our amendment is Senate Joint Resolution 128. It would require a 90-day maximum on residence requirements and would also require that where a citizen is qualified in all other respects at both his old and new residence, he shall be permitted to vote for President and Vice President. I believe that this is a very important and meaningful electoral reform, and it is my hope that the Congress will act upon it in the near future.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

V. EFFICIENCY IN ELECTION PROCEDURES

Whereas the General Federation of Women's Clubs is cognizant that, to effect the greatest efficiency in operation, it is necessary from time to time to review methods and procedures; and

Whereas modern transportation and communication facilities enable the public to become better informed on candidates and issues and eliminate the necessity for lengthy campaigns; and

Whereas the method of electing the President and Vice President of the United States merits consideration and study; and

Whereas many responsible citizens in changing their place of residence have been deprived of their right of franchise in national elections due to the variation in State residency laws: Therefore

Resolved, That the General Federation of Women's Clubs urges that a bipartisan committee be appointed by the Congress of the United States to study and make recommendations for modern, efficient, and equitable campaigns and election procedures.

(Submitted by the resolutions committee.)

Juvenile Delinquency Control Act

SPEECH OF

HON. DELBERT L. LATTA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1961

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 8028) to provide Federal assistance for projects which will evaluate and demonstrate techniques and practices leading to a solution of the Nation's problems relating to the prevention and control of juvenile delinquency and youth offenses and to provide training and personnel for work in these fields, and for other purposes.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Chairman, I support the passage of H.R. 8028, a bill designed to "provide Federal assistance for projects which will evaluate and dem-

onstrate techniques and practices leading to a solution of the Nation's problem relating to the prevention and control of juvenile delinquency and youth offenses and to provide training of personnel for work in these fields."

Having always been interested in the problem of juvenile delinquency and having chaired a special legislative committee to investigate this problem in Ohio when a member of the Ohio Senate, I cannot help but believe that the amount requested for this study is wholly inadequate to do the job that needs to be done. However, this is a start in the right direction and I support the effort.

Home-Study Man of the Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM W. SCRANTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. SCRANTON. Mr. Speaker, I was present recently when Secretary of Commerce Luther H. Hodges received the first Home-Study Man of the Year Award from International Correspondence Schools of Scranton, Pa. Standing nearby was the 7 millionth student to enroll with this world famous home-study institute and he, like Secretary Hodges some four decades before him, chose a course related to his job so that he can move ahead and qualify for new job opportunities as they evolve.

The people of my State have ample reason to be proud of the national and international educational service provided by this leader among home-study institutes, a fact duly recognized by the States of Ohio—where "Mr. Seven Million" comes from—and Pennsylvania, and the city of Scranton, which proclaimed August 14 to be "Home-Study Week" and singled out ICS for special commendation.

The campus of ICS, often called the world's schoolhouse, has always been in Scranton. It was founded by Thomas J. Foster, editor of the Shenandoah Miners Herald, who first realized the value of home study when question and answer columns in his paper helped prospective mining supervisors pass State examinations. Modern technology long ago made the first ICS course in coal mine safety obsolete, but keeping up with the rapidly changing job requirements of our dynamic economy has always been a prime objective of ICS. The successful use of special courses it developed to help train U.S. military personnel in both World Wars led to the establishment of the Armed Forces Institute. Nor can we ignore the heavy reliance that our opponent in the cold war is putting on home study—it has been estimated that some 50 percent of all persons being educated at the college level in Soviet Rus-

sia are studying with 22 institutions by the correspondence method.

In our country, it seems inevitable that there will be an increasing demand for accredited home-study courses to help upgrade job skills, raise general educational levels, expand cultural horizons and broaden human understanding. On the basis of past performance, those of us from Pennsylvania have every expectation that International Correspondence Schools will make a major contribution toward meeting these learning needs of our Nation.

The text of the Home-Study Award to Secretary Hodges follows:

HOME STUDY MAN OF THE YEAR FOR 1961

To the Honorable Luther H. Hodges, U.S. Secretary of Commerce—

Whose own career in private business and public service is an inspiration to the more than 2 million Americans now engaged in home study, exemplifying as it does, the priceless qualities of personal sacrifice, thirst for knowledge and a determination to qualify for and succeed in the most challenging assignments; and

Whose creative leadership as Secretary of Commerce is uniting every sector of our economy in an alliance for economic progress, geared to the modernization of U.S. industry and the maximizing of new employment and reemployment opportunities for American workers; and

Whose public expression of his own confidence in the vitality of the private economy was a significant factor in stimulating a business upturn and stemming unemployment early in 1961; and

Whose tireless efforts to improve the business climate at home and pioneer new markets for U.S. goods abroad, projects the useful vigor and confidence of a free society; wherein business has a voice in the deliberations of government while discharging its responsibility to serve the public interest, International Correspondence Schools, oldest and largest home-study institute in the United States, presents its Home Study Man of the Year Award for 1961 and confers upon Secretary Hodges membership in its hall of fame.

JOHN C. VILLAUME,
President.

(Presented to Hon. Luther H. Hodges in Washington, D.C., August 16, 1961.)

All Unnecessary Spending Should Be Curtailed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, many of my constituents are puzzled over the administration's continued request for record spending on new domestic programs in this period when it is necessary to commit vast sums to strengthen America's defenses at home and throughout the world. Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to share with my colleagues a letter I received from Mr. Joseph C. Drilling, managing director

of station WJW-TV, Cleveland, Ohio, which clearly expresses the thoughts of so many on this subject:

WJW-TV TELEVISION,
Cleveland, Ohio, August 7, 1961.
The Honorable FRANCES P. BOLTON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

My DEAR Mrs. BOLTON: I have been concerned for some time about our public spending under the present administration. Recently, action was taken which influenced me to write to you with an expression of opinion concerning some of the vital expenditures being made and being contemplated by the Government.

It is, I feel, important that emphasis be placed on the subject as one of service to the country and your constituents, and not merely as the vocal objection of a single taxpayer.

The contemplated deficit is difficult to understand and even more perplexing to accept. No sound businessman likes a deficit operation and I personally feel the administration should look to reducing rather than increasing this deficit.

In regard to the explosive Cuban situation and the overall foreign relations policy, strength is needed. I am in complete accord with a strong policy in foreign relations and the essential military strength to support it. Funds to support this foreign relations policy can be readily obtainable, should the Government substantially reduce the nonmilitary expenditures. A wealth of unnecessary items are draining the moneys from vital areas. I feel it is most important that we stress the need to cut down on heavy outlays in the direction of farm relief and foreign relief, to name just a few.

Without evidence of a reduction in unnecessary political spending, which is not now visible, individuals and companies are distressed at the call to tighten their belts. We are all eager to do our part and will continue our concerted effort toward the best interests of our country. I hold great hope that you will help influence your colleagues to follow some of the thoughts I have expressed.

Thank you sincerely for your considerations of the past and those of the future. We stand ready to assist you at any time.

Cordially,

JOSEPH C. DRILLING,
Managing Director.

Airline Proposes Tourist's Scheme

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD W. CANNON

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, Bonanza Air Lines, which is the first airline in the Nation to convert entirely to jets, recently inaugurated a new program of low excursion fares and less expensive air travel in the four States served by this important Nevada company.

From all indications, the excursion fare program has proven a financial success in increased volume and also as a cure for declining airline revenues. The operators are hopeful that increased commercial revenues will have the salutary effect of reducing subsidies.

The new program, which I hope will become widely adopted in the aviation industry, could be of great assistance to the U.S. foreign travel service, which seeks to promote tourism from foreign lands to this country.

I ask unanimous consent that the article dealing with Bonanza Air Lines' proposals which appeared in the New York Times on August 5, 1961, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AIRLINE PROPOSES TOURISTS' SCHEME: WOULD SELL NONRESIDENTS UNLIMITED TRAVEL TICKETS

(By Joseph Carter)

Bonanza Air Lines, which appears to have struck a rich lode in excursion fares, has come up with another travel plan, which it describes as "entirely new for airlines."

G. Robert Henry, executive vice president of the western carrier, said in a telephone interview in Las Vegas, Nev., yesterday, that the plan "should go over with a bang."

Bonanza has filed a proposal with the Civil Aeronautics Board under which customers living outside the four-State Bonanza area could buy unlimited travel over the system for 15 days for \$90, or 30 days at \$160. The airline, which operates in California, Arizona, Nevada, and Utah, wants to put the program in effect October 1.

Original transportation to that area would have to begin at points in this country east of the Mississippi, or in Alaska, Hawaii, or below the 25th parallel in Mexico or other points outside the United States.

Mr. Henry compared the Bonanza air tour plan to the successful Eurallpass, available to North and South Americans on 13 European railroads since January 1959. For \$110 Eurallpass permits unlimited travel on any member railroad, for 1 month. A \$150 pass is good for 2 months, and a \$180 pass for 3 months.

The airline executive said Bonanza had received a number of expressions of interest from foreign and domestic carriers concerning the air tour proposal.

PASSENGERS UP 20 PERCENT

Mr. Henry said the airline carried 154,117 passengers in the first half of the year, a gain of 20 percent over the similar period of 1960. Bonanza flew 38,639,000 passenger-miles in the first 6 months of this year for a gain of 21 percent.

Bonanza excursion fares started in April. Mr. Henry said that traffic in the excursion markets in the second quarter of this year was 121 percent greater than in the comparable period last year. "While revenue plane-miles flown in the first half were down slightly," he continued, "reduced resort and commercial fares produced far more than enough additional traffic to offset lowered yield."

The airline operates nine 40-passenger Fairchild F-27A jet-prop transports. It serves major cities and resorts in the four States.

The carrier has two excursion fares currently in effect. One is a 7-day commuter fare with a reduction of about 25 percent on several routes without any restriction on days of use. The other is a 10-day time restrictions and discounts of 22 to 38 percent.

Mr. Henry noted that the airline filed a so-called youth-fare plan with the CAB in June providing for a 50-percent discount to travelers 12 to 21 years of age. It is similar to the plans announced late last month and early this month by American and other airlines.

Mr. Henry said the Bonanza plan was rejected because of technicalities but was refiled with the Board last month. The

airline intends to put it into effect August 10. "It would allow reservations at any time," he said, "and is not on a space-available basis as are the plans of the other carriers."

Depressed?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACKSON E. BETTS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, when the depressed areas bill was sent to Congress by the President we were urged to pass it at once because of the immediate need for legislation in this field. The following editorial from the Findlay, Ohio, Republican-Courier indicates how unnecessary it is to have this program. It further indicates that the taxpayers are becoming a bit weary of having their hard-earned money spent on useless projects and the needless expansion of Federal bureaus. It has become apparent that some of the New Frontier programs ought to have been studied more carefully before they were whiplashed through Congress:

DEPRESSED?

Many Congressmen and citizens questioned the utility of the new Depressed Areas Act and pointed out its shortcomings. Pleas of "national need" and sympathy for the unemployed drowned them out, though, and the law now is being carried out.

Seldom does a new law verify the misgivings of its critics so quickly.

Even Congressmen who voted for it are amazed that already one county in every four in the United States has been declared a depressed area. Often this has come as a surprise to the local people, who hadn't noticed any distress.

Dawson County in central Nebraska, which earned \$60 million through farming last year, found itself "depressed" by Federal definition. Just before the label was attached, a new auto parts plant was finished in Dawson County town of Cozad.

The plant cost \$4.5 million, and needed 250 workers. The owners had a hard time recruiting a work force—because of full employment.

Senator JOHN TOWER of Texas complains that 47 east Texas towns have been declared depressed, and are nothing of the kind. For instance, in a typical recent week the depressed little city of Tyler began building new homes worth a third of a million dollars.

Officialdom in Washington celebrated the declaration of Gassville, Ark., as a Depressed Area No. 1. Gradually the facts came out. There will be 1,000 new jobs there, all right, but dickering for the new plant had been going on for years and was clinched when a necessary \$535,000 bond issue was approved by local voters before any Federal aid was available. Gassville will get \$129,000 as a gift from the rest of us to build a new water system.

If the Depressed Area Act hadn't been passed, the area would have raised this money locally, too. But now that the fact is in force, people everywhere will look to the U.S. Treasury first instead of using their own resources.

The passage of this law points up the necessity of skepticism about new welfare legislation at a time when defense spending must be heavy. We could easily depress the other three-quarters of the United States.

An Old but True Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, no one has been penalized more severely for his improved efficiency than the American farmer who has been caught in a cost-price squeeze. Since 1947 to 1949 the prices the farmer received for his crops and livestock have dropped 12 percent while the price he pays has risen 20 percent. As his production efficiency has gone up his income has gone down, yet a large segment of the American people, especially those living in large urban areas, still believe that the American farmer is coddled by Government. An enlightening article on this subject written by Mr. Carl Wickstrom, of Marshfield, Mo., recently was published in many southwest Missouri newspapers and under leave to extend and revise my remarks the article follows:

AN OLD BUT TRUE STORY

According to the best estimates of our intelligence experts and our foreign relations specialists; Russia, Red China, and the satellite countries do not want an all-out war at the present time. They are avoiding war because of a food shortage.

Today, the Iron Curtain countries are in trouble with their food supply. And, apparently, it's fortunate they are because the lack of food seems to be a major deterrent to an all-out war. If this is true, it follows that our Nation's food supply is as important to us in a military sense as it is to our economic system.

A lot of people are badly misinformed concerning American agriculture. Few people realize that the total investment in American agriculture is nearly \$200 billion. Even in these days when we speak of millions and billions, the investment in agriculture adds up to a lot of money.

Remember, too, that agriculture is the biggest single industry in the United States, directly employing 7.1 million workers. It takes 6 million workers to supply farmers with their production needs, and about another 10 million to store, transport, process, and merchandise the products of American agriculture. The United States has grown from a Nation in which 1 of every 4 workers had to produce food, to a Nation where 1 farmer produces food for 26 people.

Today, most people in the world spend one-half of their disposable income for food. In some nations it is necessary to work 18 hours a day just to be reasonably sure of a meager and not too nourishing meal, two times a day. By way of contrast, in the United States consumers spend about one-fifth, or 20 percent of their income for food. That leaves 80 percent for the products of industry; houses, medical care, education, and recreation. The farmers are furnishing more and better food now than they did 10 or 15 years ago.

If a consumer in 1960 had bought the same kinds and quantities of food he ate in 1935, he would have spent only 14 percent of his present-day income. The consumers are paying for special packaging, inspections, etc.

For all items on the cost of living index other than food, the increase to mid-1961 was 31 percent. Transportation was up more than 46 percent, housing 32 percent, rent 43 percent and medical care 60 percent.

Food (and this includes food served in restaurants) increased not quite 21 percent.

Putting it another way, 1 hour's work in a factory buys a lot more food today than it did 20 or 30 years ago. In 1929 an hour's labor would buy one-half pound of round steak, by 1939 it had increased to 1.8 pounds, and in 1960 an hour's labor would buy 2.2 pounds of steak. As far as milk goes, in 1929 an hour's labor bought 7.8 pints of milk. This had increased to 10.4 pints in 1939 and today you can get 17.6 pints of milk for an hour's labor.

Let's look at what has happened to the farmer. The farmer's share of the food dollar in 1960 was 39 cents, 40 cents in 1940 and 53 cents in the war year, 1945. As a general rule, the farmer's share of our food dollar declines as the amount of food processing increases. The wheatgrower's share of the consumer dollar spent for white flour is 33 cents. When the flour is mixed with other ingredients and baked as white bread, the farmer's share of his wheat drops to 11 cents. The farmer's share of the consumer dollar spent for milk last year was 43 cents.

We find the consumer on the plus side right down the ledger sheet. Yet, in far too many cases the consumer still pictures the farmer as an inefficient public charge receiving gigantic sums of money in subsidies and Government aid. And, what about this efficiency business? Efficiency is a favorite word of a good many experts. Let's apply it to agriculture and see how it measures up.

One hour of farm labor today produces four times as much food as it did in the 1920's. Crop production is 65 percent per acre higher. Output per breeding animal is 88 percent greater. Productivity of the American farmworker is now increasing about three times as fast as the productivity of workers in industry.

That is the farmer's record of efficiency, but he hasn't profited from it. He has been caught in a cost-price squeeze. Since 1947-49 the prices the farmer received for his crops and livestock have dropped 12 percent while the price he pays has risen 20 percent. Thus, while the farmer has continued his production efficiency at an unmatched and unprecedented rate, his income has gone down.

There probably is no simple answer to the farm problem. There are a lot of complexities to producing, processing and distributing food for 175 million people each and every day of the year. On the other hand, before a solution to the farm problem can be found, the understanding of the nonfarm segment of America is a must. So, let's tell the American consumer our side of the story. The American farmer has nothing to be ashamed of. On the contrary, there is every reason for pride and self-assurance in the heritage of American agriculture.

Where Los Angeles Stands on the Upper Colorado Transmission Lines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, the President's budget includes an item of some \$13 million to continue construction of the Federal transmission system for the Upper Colorado River project. The Los

Angeles Department of Water and Power in my State is a major user of Colorado River power, as well as water.

To clarify any possible misunderstanding in connection with the transmission line question, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an explanatory telegram that I have received from Los Angeles. It is from Mr. Samuel B. Nelson, general manager of the department of water and power, dated August 26, 1961.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
August 26, 1961.

HON. CLAIR ENGLE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

A question has been raised as to whether an appropriation for Federal construction of the transmission lines serving the Colorado River storage project would adversely affect the interests of the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power. We believe that it would not, and we recommend this appropriation, although our system is not included within the service area of the proposed lines.

We, with other California agencies, have urged Federal development of the Colorado River between Glen Canyon and Hoover Dam (including the Bridge Canyon, Marble Canyon and Kanab project sites, and transmission lines interconnecting them with each other and with Glen Canyon Dam). We believe that power generated on the Colorado in the lower basin will be more equitably distributed among the States of Arizona, Nevada, and California if all dams, powerplants and transmission lines on the river are federally owned than if any of them are built and owned under license by individual States or State agencies.

We believe that Federal ownership of the Colorado River storage project lines will facilitate interchange of upper basin and lower basin power to the advantage of all. We believe that this consideration should be controlling in this instance, quite aside from any policy or political choice as between private and public power.

SAMUEL B. NELSON,
General Manager and Chief Engineer,
Department of Water and Power,
City of Los Angeles.

Protest Against Any Attempt To Muzzle or Gag the Military

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN REIFEL

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a letter to the President of the United States from a highly respected citizen of my State, Mr. Ulric M. Gwynn, Jr., manager of the Aberdeen Chamber of Commerce.

Freedom of speech is among our most cherished rights in this great Nation. Mr. Gwynn, together with countless other citizens, is rightly concerned over the possibility of any abridgement of that freedom.

Military officials are guaranteed that constitutional right just as fully as any other citizen. Yet, our military leaders are attacked and condemned when, based upon their unique qualifications gained from firsthand observation available to few of us, they attempt to alert our citizenry to the menace of the international Communist conspiracy.

The much-publicized case of General Walker is a case in point. Mr. Gwynn's letter refers to criticism leveled against Capt. Robert T. Kieling, commanding officer of the Naval Air Station at Minneapolis, who performed a notable public and patriotic service in participating in an action seminar on this subject.

I am grateful that a constituent of mine is among those raising their voices in protest against any attempt to "muzzle" or "gag" the military. Mr. Gwynn is but one of many who are shocked and concerned at recent happenings suggesting such a turn of events.

The letter follows:

AUGUST 29, 1961.

PRESIDENT JOHN F. KENNEDY,
White House, Washington, D.C.

DEAR PRESIDENT KENNEDY: I was privileged to be a participant in the program known as "Project Action," presented at the Naval Air Station, Minneapolis, Minn., on April 28 and 29, 1961. I have been very much amazed at certain statements in the press attributed to Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, in which criticism has been leveled at Capt. Robert T. Kieling, commanding officer of the Naval Air Station at Minneapolis.

It is my opinion that Captain Kieling performed with dignity fitting his command and his position as a naval officer of the U.S. Service. At no time in any of his welcome comments was he critical of your administration and, in fact, was inspiring in his remarks of awakening American citizens to take an active part in informing themselves against international communism.

The speakers who appeared on the 2-day seminar left no doubt in my mind that a grassroots understanding by every man, woman, and child in this country is necessary if the American ideals are to be upheld. One of the speakers, Dr. Gerhart Niemeyer, emphatically pointed out he could not talk on the subject "The Philosophy of Communism" since the word philosophy from the Greeks meant love, and there is no love in communism.

As President of the United States and as Commander-in-Chief of the armed services of our great Nation, I am certain it will be your earnest endeavor to preserve for all, a continuing awareness and appreciation of the heritages which we hold so dear.

Respectfully yours,

ULRIC M. GWYNN, JR.

Mrs. Harold Price, Aid on Hospital Ship "Hope"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the hospital ship *Hope* is soon to return to the United States after about a year of work in the Far East as a medical teaching

center. During the time the ship was anchored at Saigon, Mrs. Harold L. Price of Hazleton, Pa., served as a volunteer secretary.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article about Mrs. Price which appeared in the Hazleton Sentinel on August 12, 1961.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HAZLETON WOMAN IS AID ON STAFF OF HOSPITAL SHIP "HOPE" IN CAPITAL OF SOUTH VIETNAM—MRS. HAROLD PRICE HELPS PROJECT WHILE HUSBAND SEEKS COAL DEPOSITS

Mrs. Harold L. Price, of Hazleton, was in Saigon, feeling a little bit bored. She was living in the handsome old Majestic Hotel overlooking the Saigon River, in one of the world's loveliest cities.

But her husband, who is in South Vietnam for the International Cooperation Administration leading a team of engineers searching for anthracite in the jungle, was only in Saigon 5 days a month. Without household chores, Mrs. Price didn't have much to do.

At home in Hazleton, Mrs. Price had been active. She is past president of the League of Women Voters, on the board of directors of the Crippled Children's Association, a volunteer Red Cross worker, and had been a nurse's aid.

One day, she was walking on Tu Do Street when she ran into Ralph Bellamy, whom she had seen in movies and Broadway plays. When two Americans meet halfway around the world, they don't wait for introductions.

"I asked him what he was doing in Saigon," Mrs. Price said. "He told me he was making a documentary film for NBC about the hospital ship *Hope*." The *Hope* is tied in the Saigon River across the street from Mrs. Price's hotel. It has been there since arriving in South Vietnam in mid-June on the last phase of its maiden voyage.

"He asked me what I was doing," Mrs. Price went on, "and I told him almost nothing. He said they needed extra help on the ship and the next morning I went down there and was put to work immediately."

Mrs. Price, whose Hazleton home is at 125 West Fern Street, is now a volunteer secretary aboard *Hope*, handling communications between the 15,000-ton ship and the shore points where *Hope* staff members are working. She is in charge of the communications center.

The *Hope* is a former Navy hospital ship which was loaned to the People to People Health Foundation for use as a medical teaching center. The project is supported by contributions from the American public and much of its equipment and supplies came in the form of donations from business and industry.

Like Mrs. Price, many of its medical staff are volunteers. The group includes a permanent corps of doctors, nurses, dentists, technicians, pharmacists, and secretaries who sailed from the United States last fall and spent 7½ months working in the islands of the Republic of Indonesia before going to South Vietnam.

These people are joined for periods of several months at a time by physicians who are specialists from many fields of medicine. They go to *Hope* as unpaid volunteers, then are replaced by others in their fields as they come home to resume their practices. (One of these volunteers now with *Hope* in Saigon is Dr. Howard Kremer, a Philadelphia internist.)

The staff of *Hope* is widely scattered in Saigon. The ship is anchored in the city, but the staff files off to Delta villages to hold clinics and goes ashore to six city hospitals, where *Hope* personnel are working and teaching.

Meanwhile, the ship's wards are full and three operating rooms are busy all day. Vietnamese nurses, medical interns and residents are working and studying aboard the floating medical center.

Communications is an important part of the *Hope* Saigon program, and Mrs. Price is filling a great need.

The Hazleton couple will be in Saigon until next March, though Mrs. Price's *Hope* chores will last only until September, when the ship returns to the United States from its first mission.

Until then, Mrs. Price will be working an 8:30-to-5 day on the ship and she says, enjoying it tremendously.

**Vowing She Would Ne'er Consent,
Consented**

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABNER W. SIBAL

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, Arthur Krock has an excellent analysis of the foreign-aid legislation in this morning's New York Times. He quite correctly observes that the conference report represents a position the administration now accepts as wholly satisfactory, although opposing it vigorously for weeks. In fact, the administration could have had substantially the same provisions as provided in the conference report by adopting the Byrd amendment. I submit that the conference report is a clear example of sound congressional action, correcting unsound executive proposals. Under leave to extend my remarks, I offer Mr. Krock's column for the RECORD:

**VOWING SHE WOULD NE'ER CONSENT,
CONSENTED**

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, August 30.—It takes a lot to surprise Senator BYRD of Virginia where events in the arena of politics are concerned. But even he must have rubbed his eyes when he read last night's White House statement that the agreement of the House-Senate conferees on the modus operandi for long-term development loans in the foreign aid program was "wholly satisfactory" to the President.

For the conferees agreed on a 5-year "authorization" of the President to make development loan commitments in a total of \$7.2 billion, with an actual appropriation of \$1.2 billion for fiscal 1962, but "subject" to annual appropriations by Congress. But what the President had fought for to the finish was a Treasury borrowing credit of \$8.8 billion over 5 years, entirely freed of the restraint of the annual appropriation procedure of Congress. And the administration had proclaimed with one voice that this delegation of Congress' power of the purse was absolutely indispensable to the viability of the development loan program.

SURPRISE FOR SENATOR BYRD

But there was a more personal factor of surprise for Senator BYRD in the White House announcement. The President had successfully used extraordinary pressures to defeat a Byrd amendment which gave him the same 5-year authorization to commit the full \$8.8 billion he sought for development loans, \$8.8 billion more than the conferees authorized, subject only to the same annual appropri-

tion procedure of Congress the conferees imposed.

The White House explained this about-face on the differing phraseology of the conference report and the Byrd amendment, asserting that the latter "recognized the necessity for this Government to give assurance that assistance will continue to be forthcoming over a period of years." On this wholly semantic argument the administration based its rating of the conference report as "wholly satisfactory" in contrast with the Byrd amendment. But the following text of the amendment invites the conclusion that this was a tactical move to cover an enforced retreat:

There is hereby authorized to be appropriated [supplied] to the President for use in carrying out [the long-term development loans program] such sums, not to exceed \$1,187 million for use beginning in the fiscal year 1962, and not to exceed \$1,900 million for use beginning in the fiscal years 1963 through 1966, as the Congress shall determine to be necessary, which amounts shall remain available until expended.

THINGS EQUAL TO THE SAME THING

One is as clear a congressional statement of intent as the other. And the practical restraint imposed by Congress' retention of the power of the purse is precisely the same in the conferees' language—"subject only to the annual appropriation of such funds"—as in BYRD's language—"as the Congress shall determine to be necessary," because each specifies an authorized 5-year commitment total in annual amounts. Except that BYRD's total increases the amount authorized. This fundamental similarity, including the rejection by both of the President's basic request for foreclosed 5-year Treasury borrowing authority, was generally acknowledged here today, as for example this comment by the Evening Star: "The compromise finally agreed upon is virtually identical with the BYRD amendment."

For his own part, Senator BYRD observed that the conferees' report and its acceptance by the President "vindicated the efforts" of himself, the House Republicans and some others, "to preserve to Congress the right to appropriate, and assured that each year's appropriation for development loans committed would be properly expended." But he wondered with many others why, and on what counsel, the President had been induced to climb out so far on a weak limb from which his retreat had to be made in full public view.

In such circumstances as these, however, the direct consequences so freely prophesied rarely materialize. The administration of foreign aid, particularly of development loan projects, will probably be greatly improved by the refusal of Congress to relinquish its only effective power of review of Government spending. The President's leadership will suffer no serious permanent damage from his defeat, and even may usefully impel him to reappraise the judgment of some advisers. And the principle of long-term development planning has been salvaged by Congress from the blunders of its advocates.

Foreign Aid Financing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD G. MCINTIRE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. MCINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, in a large sense the consideration of the

foreign-aid bill was a contest of the wills of the executive and legislative branches of Government, testing whether this country's purse strings should be handled in a free and easy manner by the Chief Executive or jealously guarded by the legislators.

Now that the conferees have filed a report, each one of the contestants is claiming victory, and I insert into the RECORD two editorial articles from two leading newspapers presenting some highly interesting observations concerning who might have won and who might have lost:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Aug. 31, 1961]

BOUND BY BILLIONS

It's clear enough that the administration won't get the kind of long-term financing of foreign-aid loans it wanted. But a fairly obvious defeat is being hailed by some as a moral victory for the White House.

As whipped into shape by a House-Senate conference committee, the aid-financing bill omits the administration scheme of direct Treasury borrowing. Instead, it authorizes loan spending of up to \$7.2 billion over the next 5 years and empowers the administration to make commitments to foreign countries in advance of annual congressional appropriations. This grant of authority, it's said, puts Congress under a new moral commitment to make good U.S. aid promises as they come due.

Congress has committed itself, to be sure. But when in the past 15 years has Congress not been committed to maintaining a U.S. foreign-aid program? Wisely or not, Congress has in practice long given U.S. policymakers assurance that foreign aid won't be cut off abruptly.

But Congress is no more bound now than it ever was to give the aid givers precisely the program they want. For all the talk of aid financing, the debate this year actually was about whether the White House or Congress would set the standards by which U.S. aid is judged. In keeping the check of annual appropriations, Congress has sensibly upheld its right to tell the White House where it's wrong.

And there are plenty of things that can go wrong with the administration's new aid plans. Moreover, many assumptions and practices proved wrong and wasteful in the past remain unchanged. In a sense, the administration has won a considerable victory in convincing a skeptical Congress that new billions ought to be committed on the strength of promised reforms.

So there is indeed a moral commitment involved in the foreign-aid program. But it falls squarely on the administration which has promised to Congress and the American people that foreign aid will be wisely spent.

[From the Washington Evening Star, Aug. 30, 1961]

WHOLLY SATISFACTORY

It may seem like a typographical error, but it isn't. For this is what the White House actually said—that the foreign aid financing compromise worked out by Senate-House conferees is "wholly satisfactory."

This compromise agreement authorizes the President to make foreign aid commitments over a 5-year period. But there will be no Treasury borrowing or, as some called it, "back-door financing."

Mr. Kennedy wanted legislative authority to finance the program through Treasury borrowing, and some of his aids were suggesting that doomsday would be just around the corner if he didn't get it. But these dire forecasts evidently were part and parcel of what the late Wendell Willkie used to call "campaign oratory." For now that the

battle is over, the White House puts its stamp of approval on the compromise and correctly says that it provides "reasonable assurance" that long-term aid commitments will be met.

The main objective—orderly planning on a long-range basis—surely is attainable under this compromise. The necessary appropriations, of course, will have to be sought on an annual basis. But this, we think, is as it should be, for Congress, as a matter of principle, ought not to surrender its control over the public purse. The granting of authority to make commitments obviously imposes a special duty on Congress in the future to refrain from the kind of politicking which would expose this country to accusations of bad faith. We do not believe there will be any difficulty on this score, however, provided the commitments made are sound and that the program as a whole is competently administered.

Major credit for this victory for sound financing belongs to the Republicans in the House. But it might be pointed out that much time could have been saved if the administration had been willing to accept the amendment offered early this month by Senator BYRD of Virginia. The compromise finally agreed upon is virtually identical with the Byrd amendment.

Testimony of Congressman Philip J. Philbin, Third Massachusetts District, Before Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements, House Foreign Affairs Committee, on House Joint Resolution 488, To Establish a Temporary Loan Guarantee Program for the 1962 World Sport Parachuting Championship, August 29, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to insert testimony which I recently gave before the distinguished House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements, urging Federal encouragement and support of the 1962 World Sport Parachuting Championship to be held at Orange, Mass.:

TESTIMONY OF CONGRESSMAN PHILIP J. PHILBIN, THIRD MASSACHUSETTS DISTRICT, BEFORE SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND MOVEMENTS, HOUSE FOREIGN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE, ON HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 488, TO ESTABLISH A TEMPORARY LOAN GUARANTEE PROGRAM FOR THE 1962 WORLD SPORT PARACHUTING CHAMPIONSHIP, AUGUST 29, 1961

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, as author of one of the bills to establish a temporary loan guarantee program in connection with the 1962 World Sport Parachuting Championship to be held at Orange, Mass., I am very thankful indeed for the expeditious manner in which this outstanding committee has scheduled hearings on these bills and, of course, for the opportunity to appear here today.

In my opinion, great importance is attached to this scheduled event, which is the sixth World Sport Parachuting Championship.

You recall that you previously considered and reported what is now Public Law 86-796, providing for an invitation to attend this great event and such invitation has been delivered by an official of the American Embassy in Vienna to the Parachuting Committee of the Federation Aeronautique Internationale and has already been accepted by 15 or more nations.

It should be noted that the selection of the United States as host for 1962 was opposed publicly by the Soviet Union on the grounds that this country could not conduct a championship parachuting event as well as the three previous events of this type which were held behind the Iron Curtain.

As planned, this sixth championship will be the largest international aviation competition ever held in the Western Hemisphere. The championship will be conducted over a 26-day period in August, of 1962. Fourteen of these days will be competition days—the remainder scheduled for rest and recreation of the competitors. It is expected that from 15 to 20 nations of the world will be represented and that up to 500,000 spectators will attend. In 1958, 600,000 people attended the fourth biannual competition at Bratislava, Czechoslovakia.

I am informed that as host State, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts has appropriated \$125,000, and that \$100,000 of this appropriation is contingent upon at least a matching amount from a Federal source.

For that reason, if this important championship is to be assured for the United States, the Congress must immediately approve legislation guaranteeing a loan by private banks to the nonprofit championship corporation in an amount not to exceed \$500,000.

These funds would be employed to promote the championship on a national and international level and as operating funds for the competition period—August 9 to September 4, 1962. The \$100,000 provided by the Commonwealth will be allocated for promotion on a statewide basis, improving the present facility and planning and coordinating the event.

I am informed that management consultants retained by the commission promoting the event have estimated that if the championship is promoted on a modest scale, it will gross proceeds sufficient to pay all the expenses of the event.

In that case, of course, the proposed loan guarantee of the Federal Government would be inoperative and the Government would never have to pay out 1 cent.

So far as I am concerned, I would not be concerned even if the Federal Government would underwrite the entire obligation because I feel strongly that apart from promoting international good will and encouraging a rather unique and very valuable sport, that there are extremely vital tones of the national interest involved in this proposal.

The Soviet has long since been following the policy of encouraging and supporting organized sport in all fields. The Soviet has not only set up but has financially supported an extensive and large international program in Russia itself and among the satellites to promote sports of every kind, and this has accounted in large measure for the fine showing that Russia has been able to make in the past two Olympic games. There can be no question that this type of activity has been strongly subsidized by the Soviet.

But as meritorious as this feature of the proposal is, I am not arguing for the program provided for by the bill on this ground

alone. I am convinced that this is but another field in which we should and must eagerly enter into determined and extensive competition with the Soviet and other nations of the world. We cannot afford to be behind any nation in this kind of activity. The encouragement of sport is involved here, to be sure, but so is the entire gamut of competitive activity which in this time of stress, anxiety, and pressure, this Nation must be prompted to engage in to retain its prestige in the world, adequately meet its international commitments, and properly defend the United States. In the Soviet world, hundreds of thousands of boys are engaged in parachute jumping and related sports. The roll is growing larger every day so that, indeed, we are led to believe that millions of boys are participating in this activity.

Whether you call this activity sport, as it certainly is viewed in one sense, or whether you call it preparation for national fitness in time of emergency and danger, it seems to me that the proposal is of such merit as to be mandatory and imperative.

I in fact, for my part, I do not see how it could be rejected and ignored at a time when the Soviet and all nations in the Communist orbit are forging ahead in this important field.

Even if the Congress has to subsidize this activity and the bill I have introduced does not require this, but calls merely for a guarantee with definite assurance of repayment, I would still feel that the proposal was justified and should be undertaken without slightest hesitancy or delay.

Whether we like it or not, we are competing with the Soviet in every field that relates to our total national potential and if we fail to do so, through inadvertence, miscalculation, or underestimation, of our opponents, we will live to regret our indifference and complacency and failure to understand the stark realities of the world in which we live.

I recognize that there will be some who consider this proposal as a waste of money, and intrusion by the Government into fields in which it has no concern. There were those who opposed Federal support of the Olympic games on this basis just as there were and are those who opposed building up the defense potentials of our own Nation and the free world.

There are those who very clearly underestimate the nature of the threat we face and perhaps overestimate our own potential even as they languish in smug complacency and apathy while the enemy stands without the gates and is, in fact, entrenched within the gates to a greater degree than many people are willing to recognize.

But I sincerely hope that the Members of the Congress will not adopt this attitude. On the contrary, I hope and pray that we may be awakened to a deep, moving awareness of the challenge confronting us and act in this matter which, in itself, calls only at the worst for assumption by the Government of relatively meager funds. Before our overall strength and readiness dangerously declines and fails to keep pace with the ruthless forces that oppose us in this confused, perilous, and crucial time in world history, I respectfully urge the chairman and members of the great Foreign Affairs Committee of the House that this bill be considered and adopted in the best national interest and that this Congress go on record as favoring closing at least this part of the gap which presently separates us from the powerful totalitarian complex that is surreptitiously and brazenly working for our destruction and the destruction of freedom in the world.

My distinguished and able colleague Congressman JAMES A. BURKE has asked me to record him as being in support of the bill.

I respectfully urge the committee to report the bill introduced by my valued col-

league, Congressman SILVIO CONTE; in whose district the event will be held.

I also ask that one of the coauthors of the bill, my distinguished and able colleague, Congressman THOMAS O'NEILL may include his views in the RECORD.

Essay by Paul Weissman on United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, a 16-year-old constituent of mine, Paul Weissman, an honor graduate this June of Dwight Morrow High School in Englewood, N.J., has won a major distinction. Among an estimated 60,000 secondary school entrants across the Nation, Paul won first prize in the annual high school contest on the United Nations sponsored by the American Association for the United Nations. His prize was a trip to Europe this summer, from which he is returning to enter Harvard University as one of 50 members of the freshman class awarded an honorary scholarship.

The high school contest on the United Nations is conducted through a 3-hour examination. Half of the scoring on the examination is based on short-answer questions of a factual nature, the other half consisting of three essay questions, answered without the aid of notes or books and within the time limit.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the essay questions asked in this year's contest and Paul Weissman's answers to them. His work shows, I believe, not only a remarkable knowledge of United Nations affairs but also a remarkable ability in original thought and clear expression under test conditions.

There being no objection, the questions and essay were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I. (20 points): You have been assigned to write an article for your school newspaper on the Congo. In explaining to your readers the significance of the problem in the Congo, discuss the following points:

A. The background of events which led to the present conflict.

B. The political, economic and geographic importance of the Congo which led to U.N. intervention.

C. The conflicting aims and policies of Congo leaders as they affect the role of the U.N.

D. U.N. purpose and policy in the Congo.

II. (15 points): When the United Nations Charter was adopted, some observers thought the General Assembly would be little more than a debating society; the Security Council, it was thought, would exercise most of the power and enjoy most of the prestige.

In a well-organized essay, explain how and why the General Assembly has tended to grow in authority and respect since 1945, while the Security Council has tended to lose power and status in public opinion. Include the following in your answer:

A. Reasons, specific events, and evidences of success or failure in actions taken.

B. Three serious weaknesses that have become apparent in the United Nations since its organization in 1945.

C. Three ways in which the United Nations might be strengthened.

III. (15 points): The following letter appeared in a metropolitan newspaper, read by millions:

"DEAR SIR: The U.N. is no good. The Communists run it. They use it to spy on our country. It costs us a fortune to belong and all we get is abuse. The whole thing will collapse just like the League of Nations, and the sooner the better. Why do we have to have this nest of traitors in our city? Let's send the United Nations to Europe."

"Yours for a safer America,

"(Name withheld)."

Answer the letter, explaining the value of the United Nations, pointing out some of its specific achievements, and its importance to America's survival.

I

It is consistent with the confusion of our modern age that the Congo, less than a year ago unknown to most of the world, should have become in so short a time the very center of the East-West conflict and thus perhaps the most important place on earth. The battle now being fought there, although more with propaganda than with guns, will decide not only the victor of a major episode in the cold war; also at stake is the very existence of the United Nations, which has put itself into mortal danger by attempting to solve the Congo's problems. For those who truly believe that the U.N. is "our last, best hope," the Congo situation is the most important crisis since the Second World War.

The roots of the U.N.'s present dilemma go back into the days of 19th century colonialism, when Britannia yet ruled the waves and all was for the best in the best of all possible worlds. Desirous of a share in the rich African Continent, Belgium's King Leopold dispatched a "trading expedition" to the present Congo area. Although he had only narrowly edged out the British and the French, Leopold soon had a huge territory, some 50 times the size of his kingdom, under his control.

For the next half century, the Congo was enslaved mercilessly to the greed of its Belgian conquerors; while the Rockefellers were building an empire in America, Leopold and his successors were making huge profits under their policy of human and mineral exploitation. Belgium, of course, had long since become a constitutional monarchy, but the Congo remained a fief of the crown, not subject to parliamentary questioning or interference. Thus, even in modern times, the Congo was as yet unacquainted with the outside world, and best known, perhaps, by the famous lines of Stephen Vincent Benet, written when the Dark Continent was still a place of mystery: "Mumbo-jumbo, god of the Congo, he will come to voodoo you."

This state of affairs persisted right up to the end of World War II. Exhausted by their mighty effort to defeat the Axis, the Allied nations sat comfortably back and prepared to resume their old, peaceful ways; but a new force, born of war and upheaval, had entered the world. In all the colonies and territories of the earth, there was a mighty wave of longing for freedom as a nation and for the full measure of dignity that goes with being a man. India was the first to break loose; many others followed after her.

In 1959, the new wave reached even the heart of Africa. Riots began in the Congo, and threatened to become worse. Whites as well as natives were being killed, while property damage was immense. It was ap-

parent to the Belgians that they could not hold on much longer; they had made the mistake that so many other colonist nations had made, and are still making, the mistake of believing that, by keeping the native population downtrodden, colonial rule could be perpetuated forever. Belgium has come very near to paying for her mistake with her life as a country, and she may yet succumb to the conflicting forces that the Congo disaster has unleashed.

Driven against a wall, Belgium's administrators at first offered independence in 10 years, then in 5, then in 2. Finally, it was agreed that July 1, 1960, should be the date when the new nation would come into being. It seems likely that the Belgians had at least an idea of what would ensue from independence; after all, their own colonial policy had seen to it that less than 3 dozen Africans were educated to any degree at all beyond high school, and that the Congo was patently incapable of governing itself. Nonetheless, they were virtually forced to accede to the African demands.

Even before being born, the Congo had two strikes against it. Its first problem was that Moïse Tshombe, political leader of the mineral-rich Katanga Province; had not been long in proclaiming that his state would of itself secede from the other Congo provinces to become an independent country in its own right. Not only would this step have deprived the Congo of a large part of its natural wealth, it would have endangered the very existence of the country as a political unit. Other dissenting factions and tribes, of which the Congo has an abundant supply, would be sure to follow Tshombe's lead.

A second problem of the Congo was political disunity in its own capital. The premiership of the new government had been hotly contested by Joseph Kasavubu, from Leopoldville Province, and Patrice Lumumba, whose strength lay in the outlying areas. Lumumba won in the balloting, although this is hardly a reliable barometer of popular opinion. In one instance, returns from two districts were lost when the canoe carrying them to Leopoldville was swept over a falls, and Kasavubu contented himself with being President and official Chief of State. But the rivalry still remained.

Burdened by these considerations, the Congo as a nation had been beaten before it began. Even before independence, the rioting started: uneducated natives thought that being free meant freedom from all restrictions whatsoever, and acted accordingly. One native was even quoted in the New York Times as asking, "Independence? Can I eat it?" Particularly endangered were the Congo's white citizens, on whom the natives seemed to be taking vengeance from decades of injustice.

A bare 2 weeks after independence had been granted, Belgium sent her troops back into the country to protect her citizens. Then began the long sequence of comic-opera events in which, as Dwight MacDonald of the New Yorker has said, "History seems to be parodying itself." Lumumba protested the Belgian intervention violently, and called on the U.N. to send troops; this was done, barely in time to prevent utter chaos. Meanwhile, Katanga had carried out its intention of seceding, and was engaged in warfare with pro-Lumumba Baluba tribesmen. Lumumba himself soon began making overtures to the Communist bloc, and for a time it looked as if a Russian beachhead had been established in Africa.

Seeing his chance to take power, however, Kasavubu fired Lumumba from the premiership, on a charge of consorting with Communists; in turn, Lumumba fired Kasavubu. Into this rather ridiculous state of affairs stepped a relatively unknown, Col. Joseph Mobutu, who proceeded to announce that

he was taking power. Eventually, Mobutu formed an alliance with Kasavubu against Lumumba; Lumumba was jailed on charges of treason and shipped to Kantanga, where he was almost certainly killed by Tshombe's henchmen, despite an elaborately faked press release.

Lumumba's death leaves the Congo on the brink of ruin. Tshombe is still defiant of the central government, and a new mining state, led by one Albert Kalonji, has appeared in southern Kasai Province. Meanwhile, Lumumba supporters have established a government of their own in the Provinces of Oriental and Equator. The West as a whole supports Kasavubu and Mobutu in Leopoldville; the Communist bloc supports the Lumumbists in the east; and Belgium supports the cooperative Tshombe. But no one of the three factions is a government in the true sense of the word, and at this moment a civil war between them seems imminent. The outcome of such a war would be important to the participants in the cold war: as has been stated, if Russia gets a toehold in the very center of Africa, it may be costly for the world's democracies. By geographical position, mineral wealth, and political significance, the Congo is just suited to assist the Soviet greatly in its plans for expansion. The danger, of course, is that, the stakes being so high, the United States and Russia will feel compelled to aid the opposing sides in the civil war and thus bring on a global conflict.

The U.N.'s role in the Congo has thus far been successful in that relative peace has been kept; but the basic problem, that of reconciling the different factions, has not been solved. Ostensibly, the U.N. is not to interfere in what many Security Council resolutions have termed "internal affairs," but the definition of this term is both difficult and hazardous. Also, the U.N. forces have been hampered by the playing of politics on the part of several national contingents in the UNEF: several delegations, including those of Morocco, Indonesia, and the UAF, have already withdrawn or are preparing to withdraw because of lack of U.N. support for the Lumumba faction.

The primary purpose of the U.N. is to keep the peace, and, to be sure, not to intervene in a nation's domestic affairs. But the course of recent events has suggested that perhaps this concept of noninterference is inadequate to the exigencies of current world affairs, and that the U.N. may have to take an active role in shaping a nation's political destiny. If so, speedy action will be needed to prevent a situation for which the entire human race will be sorry forever after.

II

It is undeniable fact that, since 1945, the Security Council has decreased considerably in importance and that its authority has in large measure been transferred to the keeping of the General Assembly. Virtually the entire responsibility for this fact must be borne by the device of the veto, written into the U.N. Charter by request of both the United States and U.S.S.R. at San Francisco in 1945.

The effect of the veto, briefly, has been to prevent the taking of any action that amounts to anything by the Security Council in an international dispute. Since any world conflict will very probably be associated with one of the five major powers, an action regarding that conflict is unlikely to receive the affirmative vote of the power involved. This truth has been demonstrated over and over again by the Security Council vetoes of Britain and France on Suez in 1956; of Russia and Hungary, in 1956 and thereafter; and of Russia on many matters relating to international inspection and arms control. In fact, the Soviet Union has to this date used the veto some 89 times in an at-

tempt to work its own will. It is not difficult to understand how effectively this device has hamstrung the Security Council's usefulness. The only exception to the prevalence of inaction, albeit a notable one, is the resolution passed in 1950 beginning the Korean war; as is well known, however, this resolution was passed during a boycott of the Council by Russia, and this constitutes no real exception to the general rule.

To some extent, the very decline of the Security Council has brought a larger measure of power to the General Assembly. Specifically, the so-called uniting-for-peace resolution, first proposed by Dean Acheson in 1950, has been instrumental in allowing the General Assembly to expand its franchise of power. The effect of the resolution is simply to allow the Assembly to consider legally any matter blocked in the Security Council by a veto. With this power, the General Assembly has been able to work successfully not only resisting aggression in Korea, but in establishing order at Suez in 1956 and in condemning the Soviet Union for its treatment of Hungary in the same year. Moreover, the very knowledge that the veto is not the absolute end of consideration of a matter has made the United Nations more flexible and far better able to cope with the problems of the world.

Nonetheless, the veto power is one serious flaw that has developed in the U.N. structure since 1945. Another such flaw is the present organization of the World Court, for two reasons: First, the Court has not been used to any great extent by the U.N.'s member nations; and second, it has not been consulted even by the General Assembly itself. As Louis B. Wehle points out in an article in the University of Pennsylvania Law Review, the Court's connection with the United Nations has been "an exercise in frustration"; less than a dozen times in its history has the General Assembly or one of its organs asked the Court for an advisory opinion. Furthermore, no action is taken against those who, although parties to the Court's statute, disobey decisions or refuse to submit cases for consideration. If the Court is to be at all effective, it must be utilized, and the United Nations itself is in the best position to encourage utilization.

A third flaw has developed in the organization of the U.N.'s Emergency Force. Recent events have made it obvious that, first, the U.N. must be equipped with a standing army responsible to the U.N. alone, and that, second, this army must have powers considerably broader than those presently given to it. U.N. operation in the Congo has been severely hampered by the political designs of those states who have furnished troops for the Emergency Force; because of Hamarskjöld's refusal to give direct aid to Lumumba and, now, Antoine Gizenga, the contingents of Morocco, Indonesia, and the United Arab Republic have already withdrawn their support. Such political maneuvering cannot be permitted to take place within the U.N.; if an international body is to have authority and respect, it must be a power of its own, subject to the rules drawn up by member states, but not dependent on these nations for its life in times of stress. Thus, a body of troops is needed which could be taken by the U.N. for its own and be made subject to no other command.

On the question of the power to be given to an emergency force, it is apparent that in the Congo the U.N.'s power is not sufficient. The policy of domestic noninterference may be wise when applied to a nation with a real government of its own, but it is absurd to force this policy to work in a country which actually is not a political unit at all, but only a fractionated salad of squabbling factions. What exists in the Congo today is a vacuum, not a government,

and thus the situation is tailor made to some sort of international political control, something analogous to a trusteeship. Certainly, unless the vacuum is filled by nations collectively, it will be the subject of a conflict between individual nations that could well become critical in a short time.

Corresponding to the three problems pointed out above, then, I think that three definite steps should definitely be taken as soon as possible: the substitution of majority rule for the veto in the Security Council; a policy of consultation with the World Court by the General Assembly and Security Council, and of respect for the Court's decisions; and an establishment of some kind of permanent world security force, solely under the command of the U.N. and empowered, where necessary, to take steps with the internal affairs of a nation in order that the peace of the rest of the world may be assured.

III

Aside from the fact that this letter probably appeared in the New York Daily News, it represents an attitude that is all too prevalent in this country, and which must be corrected if America is to participate in the shining world which, we hope, will follow upon our present era of turmoil and trouble. The basic train of thought underlying the logic of a letter like this one is that America doesn't need anyone else; we are self-sufficient and should have nothing to do with anything beyond our shores except participation as an interested, but unconcerned, observer. The writer makes specific reference to the failure of the League of Nations, but fails to point out, or to realize, that this very failure was due in large part to the isolationism of Senator Lodge and his colleagues right here in the United States. With American support—who knows?—the League might have succeeded. With success, it might have prevented the Second World War. We have let one chance slip through our hands, and have paid most dearly for it; to let another such chance go by would be an unforgivable folly. The fact is that America is not self-sufficient, nor ever will be again; by withdrawing our support from the U.N. we would sentence ourselves to damnation, and would very likely drag the rest of the world down with us.

The primary value of the U.N., of course, is in keeping the peace. The record of success has not been 100 percent; but a long string of triumphs for international law becomes apparent when we remember Iran, in 1946; India and Pakistan, in 1947; Israel, in 1948; Korea, in 1950; and Suez, in 1956. In all these cases but one, war was avoided or ended, and in the one exception, a war was fought that a more terrible war might be staved off.

This record indicates that the U.N., despite adversity such as a Hercules would fear to take on, has in truth guarded the peace of the world. To be sure, there have been reverses, events such as the Hungarian and Tibetan rebellions of 1956 and 1959 in which all that the world's democracies could do was to shake angrily in their impotence. But always, the aggressor has been made to feel the weight of hostile world opinion, a force which is not so innocuous as it sounds. At the very least, the fact that an aggressor may now be branded as such and proclaimed a criminal to the world is better than rule of the jungle, where there is no one to cry out at injustice. And perhaps, if we take steps to strengthen the U.N. now, we may yet build upon the foundation that has already been established and reach the goal of a true world government. Certainly, it is heartening to note that the new President of the United States, on being inaugurated, pledged himself and his country to the furtherance of international law.

For its protection of peace alone, the United Nations would be worth even the "fortune" that "it costs us to belong." But the U.N. is active in many fields, all of them doing good for the world's population. Old organizations, such as the UPU and ITU, have been given a place in the framework of the U.N. where they may continue their work. Others, such as the International Atomic Energy Agency, are being created every year as the need for them arises. Most important perhaps are those "specialized agencies" which contribute directly to the health and spiritual and physical well-being of the world's population. The World Health Organization fights malaria, yaws, and other crippling diseases all over the globe, and educates the poor to practice cleanliness and good health habits; UNESCO makes possible the exchange of cultural good-will missions between countries, and works to raise the world's literacy level; UNICEF feeds and cares for underprivileged children in Korea, Vietnam, Thailand, and virtually dozens of other places. Such organizations as the World Bank, International Finance Commission, and the recently created Special Fund make possible the development of riches in many underdeveloped countries and thus the raising of everyone's standard of living: projects now going on include studies for a dam on Ghana's Volta River, a dam on the Zambezi in Rhodesia, and various public-works projects in the new African state of Nigeria. As more money becomes available for loan, the number and size of the works which can be done will grow.

Finally, the U.N. acts in many areas to perform real services to the governments of the world. Among the organizations included here are the International Monetary Fund, which makes possible the exchange of world currencies; the International Civil Aviation Organization, which coordinates air flights all over the world, and gives aid to poorer nations in developing aviation systems; the International Maritime Union, which coordinates and standardizes world shipping; and the World Meteorological Organization, which makes possible the integration and unification of data on weather from all over the world.

Burns Ditch Project: Wrong Place, Wrong Time

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, August 30, yesterday, I attended the Army Engineers' hearing on the proposed harbor project in northern Indiana.

This hearing was held in Indianapolis, Ind., and was conducted by Col. Joseph A. Smedley, district director of the Chicago regional office of the Army Engineers.

I am hereby submitting the testimony and facts which I gave in person concerning my opinions and recommendations on this large expenditure of taxpayers' money:

STATEMENT OF RAY J. MADDEN, MEMBER OF CONGRESS OF INDIANA, AT ARMY ENGINEERS' HEARING ON BURNS DITCH HARBOR, INDIANAPOLIS, IND., AUGUST 30, 1961

Mr. Chairman: The building at public expense of an \$86-million harbor and port at

the proposed site just east of Burns Ditch would not be in the interest of the people of Indiana. I shall briefly state the commanding reasons why this is so.

First, I think it is clear that a harbor built at the Burns Ditch site would be of direct benefit, almost exclusively, to the two major steel companies, Midwest and Bethlehem. This is a fact which is clear on the face of the situation to anyone knowing the circumstances. This is a fact which is clearly stated by the Army Engineers' report, which, as I understand it, is being reconsidered by this hearing. Although I am informed by the Corps of Army Engineers officials in Washington that this report, "The Army Engineers' Interim Report on the Burns Waterway Harbor," dated October 1960 in their words, "is no longer considered a report" because it has been sent back to the field for reexamination.

According to this Army Engineers' report, 97.3 percent of the future benefits coming from this proposed harbor at Burns Ditch will go to the two steel companies, namely, Midwest Steel, a wholly owned subsidiary of the National Steel, and Bethlehem Steel. On page 19, paragraph 57, the report states the estimated average annual benefit will be \$8,157,000. Of this amount general cargo or shipping exclusive of steel mill operation, would account for only \$217,000. The entire balance would be accounted for by coal, iron ore, and limestone shipments for use by the two steel mills on the premises.

Mr. Chairman, I fail to see the justification for the expenditure of millions of dollars of public money to provide a harbor and port for the exclusive benefit of these two wealthy and powerful steel companies. Moreover, I find it additionally absurd to provide such a harbor in an area where only one relatively small piece of industry now exists. I might also say that the ardor of the steel companies to construct the promised steel mills is less than pressing at the moment, so it would seem public investment in a Burns Ditch Harbor would be a risky venture, at least, even if building a harbor at public expense for the almost sole use of two steel companies were otherwise justifiable. As an elected representative, Mr. Chairman, I for one, am not willing to endorse the expenditure of public funds for a risky and special interest serving private project.

Secondly, Mr. Chairman, I think there is good evidence to indicate that because of the character of the lake itself, the Burns Ditch location on Lake Michigan is simply not suitable for a harbor. It is hardly necessary to point out that the great Indiana sand dunes are high and deep at the Burns Ditch site precisely because the currents of the lake waters placed them there and continue to shift sand and other materials to this point. Again, I think the evidence on its face raises serious questions about the economics of maintaining a port at a point of maximum buildup of lake deposits. For the lake currents carry southward, stone and earth from the west banks of the lake and deposit them on the south banks, almost precisely at the Burns Ditch site. The Burns Ditch location is at the southern tip of the 50-mile north to south sweep of storms and winds coming from the north and northwest. Hence the terrific sand and deposit fill at this point.

I would encourage the Army Engineers, in their reevaluation of this Burns Ditch Harbor proposal, to fully report on the problems which certainly must come from the continuing deposit by the currents of sand, pieces of rock, and other debris. Evidence of the great force of the currents in this area is provided by the Army Engineers' interim report of October 1960 to which I have referred earlier. In appendix F, paragraph 45, it states that at this part of the lake,

there is a dominant east to west lateral transport of sand and other matter, and that the effect of the projection of a harbor into the lake at the Burns Ditch site will result each year in the erosion of 27,000 cubic yards of sand west of the harbor and equivalent fill to the east of the harbor. This seems to me good evidence of the doubtful economy of maintaining a harbor at this site. Also, it should be pointed out that these facts about the current indicate the harbor would cause increased fill at the State park, perhaps to the extent of drastically harming its beaches. This Dunes State Park is now self-supporting, but it may well be asked if it could still continue to support itself without State tax aid when faced with the expensive costs of keeping the sandfill from ruining its beaches.

Above all, Mr. Chairman, the difficulty caused in the Burns Ditch area by the lake currents, seems to me to be a strong reason for considering the feasibility and advisability of locating the proposed port further west in Lake County. I shall mention this again at the close of my remarks.

The third reason why I am opposed to the proposed spending of \$86 million or more of public funds for the construction of a harbor at Burns Ditch is, very frankly, because such an expenditure would be extremely wasteful and ill-advised at this time. I hardly need remind anyone here that the Federal Government is spending some \$88 billion in the next fiscal year and will incur a budget deficit of close to \$5.5 billion. The distinguished Representative in Congress from the Second District, Mr. HALLECK, has almost daily reminded us all of the need to cut out nonessential expenditures, and I sometimes wonder about the consistency of urging economy as minority leader of the House of Representatives, while endorsing as Second District Congressman, expenditures for a project which would primarily serve two special interests and for which neither the justification nor feasibility has been established.

I have heard talk of course, that the State of Indiana would be willing to "go it alone" and build the harbor without Federal assistance. This too makes me wonder about the urgency which leads the Burns Ditch supporters to push the harbor at any cost—whether it be by further burdening the already overtaxed citizens of Indiana or by a shared expenditure with the Federal Government.

In short, Mr. Chairman, I am strongly opposed to this proposed location of a harbor and port at Burns Ditch because it is not economically justifiable in this time of increased national defense preparation.

I cannot find in any of the recent hearings by the Army Engineers, testimony revealing the fact that efforts to construct a major harbor on the southernmost point of Lake Michigan has been tried at different intervals for 125 years.

On July 4, 1837, Senator Daniel Webster made a Fourth of July speech at Michigan City on the occasion of launching the preliminary efforts to establish a major harbor in this region.

In 1836, the Government began work of improving and expanding a harbor at Michigan City and appropriated \$20,000.

In 1837, an additional appropriation was made of \$30,000.

In 1840, a third appropriation was made and the harbor work went on under the charge of Captain Stockton of the Army and appropriation was made amounting to \$60,733.

In 1849, another appropriation by the Government of \$25,000.

In 1852, another appropriation of \$25,000.

Then, for a period of years, the Government abandoned all work on the harbor and for more than 14 years it lay a useless wreck. The primary difficulty having been the terrific storms which swept down from the 500 mile north to south stretch of Lake Michigan.

Again in 1865, the Michigan Harbor Co., through subscriptions, spent \$100,000 for piers and other work in order to make a permanent major harbor at Michigan City.

In 1867, the Congress again appropriated the sum of \$75,000.

We must remember a \$25,000 appropriation in 1850 compares to \$200,000 today.

These above facts were taken from the history of this area, procured from the Library of Congress in Washington, D.C. I mention them merely to remind the taxpayers of Indiana that the present well-promoted project did not start with the administration of Gov. Harold A. Handley.

But, Mr. Chairman, there should be a major harbor in northern Indiana, and it should be constructed where it will best serve the people of Indiana. I believe for the reasons I have stated in part here today, that the proposed port and harbor should be constructed in the industrial Calumet region where it could also serve the State of Indiana.

1. Where it would serve many industries and businesses already established, and not simply serve one industry, steel, which is only promised and which in other parts of the State is not even working at maximum levels;

2. Where adequate land for additional steel mills and other industries could be made available by filling in along the shore;

3. Where lake currents and the constant buildup of debris would not be likely to provide difficult problems to keeping the port in operation;

4. Where the feasibility of a deepwater port and harbor has already been shown by extensive study;

5. Where large numbers of skilled workers and thousands of idle and part-time workers now reside.

The last time the Lake County steel mills operated at 100 percent for an extended period was in 1946, immediately after World War II. During the last several years, the Carnegie-Illinois, Inland Steel, and Youngstown Sheet & Tube in Lake County, have operated as low as 46 percent, but with automation, increased efficiency, and modern inventions, the outlook for a 100-percent improvement in the present steel production capacity is very remote. The construction of a \$80 million harbor to promote two additional steel mills in this area will bring about further additions to the unemployment and relief rolls of northwest Indiana.

Mr. Chairman, about a month ago I filed a request with the Public Works Committee in the U.S. House of Representatives, a resolution for an exhaustive Army Engineers survey of the possibility of a major deepwater harbor located in the area adjacent to Hammond, Whiting, and East Chicago on the shores of Lake Michigan, bordering the Illinois-Indiana State line. I wish to herewith incorporate with my remarks a letter which the Honorable CHARLES A. BUCKLEY, chairman of the Committee on Public Works in the U.S. House of Representatives received from Maj. Gen. William F. Cassidy, U.S. Army, Director of Civil Works. The same speaks for itself.

I also wish to incorporate with my remarks a copy of the resolution which was passed by the Committee on Public Works in the U.S. House of Representatives on August 24, 1961, wherein this committee requested a review and survey of the Hammond, Whiting, and East Chicago shoreline for the purpose of expanding its harbor facilities as mentioned above.

What the Small Business Administration Can Do for One

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article entitled "What the Small Business Administration Can Do for You," which was written by Larston D. Farrar and published in the August 1961, issue of the Graphics Arts Monthly, the largest printing magazine in the world, I am told.

Larston Farrar, the author of this article, is noted as a writer of books, stories, and articles throughout America. He is a native of Birmingham, Ala. He held his first jobs on the old Birmingham Post—now Post-Herald—and was a featured columnist and reporter for the Birmingham News, known as "the South's greatest newspaper," at about the time I was first getting elected to Congress. He and one of my longtime associates, Charles Brewton, attended Birmingham-Southern College simultaneously in the early 1930's.

As chairman of the Senate Committee on Small Business, I am always glad to draw attention to the constructive work of the Small Business Administration, which has meant so much to so many small businessmen through the years. As is well known, my former administrative assistant, John E. Horne, is now SBA Administrator and is doing an extremely capable job in his new post. The Farrar article is a good roundup of the various services SBA performs and of how small businessmen might take advantage of these services for their benefit and for the benefit of the Nation itself.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT THE SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION Can Do for You

(By Larston D. Farrar)

The U.S. Small Business Administration, which began its 8th year of operation in July, year by year has become more of a vital force in the lives of small businessmen, including printers and others in the industry. It has become particularly important (and helpful) to those in the industry who are planning for the future and are striving to maintain a place in the expanding economy.

Just what the SBA, as it is called for short, can do for any specific businessman of course depends upon his specific needs and his desires. If the businessman is satisfied with the kind of job he is doing, the profits he is making, and so forth, obviously he needs no help from SBA, or any other source. But if he is dissatisfied, and is striving to find ways to better his operating techniques and to render a better and more efficient service to the public, there's a good chance he can get some tangible assistance from the SBA, if

he will take the trouble to learn how best to obtain the agency's services.

The SBA is not interested in any specific business, in any particular line, from a selfish standpoint. It cannot be. It is a public agency and its programs necessarily are broad and must be geared to helping all businessmen who feel the need to take advantage of its services, its credit, and so forth.

GOALS OF SBA

The major ways in which SBA might assist you are indicated in the agency's goals, as follows:

1. To give counsel to small business concerns on their financial problems; to help them to obtain financing from private lending sources, and to make loans to them when private financing is not available on reasonable terms.
2. To license, regulate, and help finance privately owned small business investment companies, which in turn extend long-term and equity-type financing to small businesses.
3. To make loans to help restore or replace businesses and homes damaged or destroyed by storms, flood and other natural disasters, and to help small businessmen who may have suffered substantial economic injury because of drought or excessive rainfall in their areas.
4. To make loans to State and local development companies to help them to provide facilities and financing for small businessmen in their areas.
5. To assist small companies in obtaining a fair share of contracts and orders for supplies and services for the Government, and a fair share of property being sold or leased by the Government.
6. To assist small firms in overcoming production problems, and in diversifying their product lines.
7. To assist small businessmen with their management problems, and to finance research into the problems of small business.
8. To sponsor and publicize management courses with institutions of higher learning in various areas, so that small businessmen may have expert assistance in studying the complexities of subjects ranging from accounting to personnel problems.

Overlooking the loan programs of SBA, the principal ways in which SBA can help you lie in the field of management education. "All studies into the causes for the failure of small businesses, in any line of endeavor, rank lack of management know-how as one of the most important factors," John E. Horne, the new SBA Administrator who took office shortly after President John F. Kennedy's inauguration, declared in an interview in Washington.

"In line with our resources and with the clear mandates of Congress as embodied in the basic law creating SBA, we intend to do everything in our power to make available to small businessmen the very latest managerial techniques we can devise and distribute. It is our hope that, through business journals and other media, we can help every present small businessman, and all those who are interested in becoming small businessmen, to learn all the possible angles to managing themselves, their employees, and their businesses in such a way as not only to stay in business but to grow with a growing economy."

TECHNICAL, MANAGEMENT AIDS

The Small Business Administration's educational program for businessmen takes various forms. Perhaps the one that has been most widespread, in net effect, has been the regular release of both technical aids leaflets and management aids leaflets by SBA, each of which deals with some specific phase of management, ranging from accounting and bookkeeping to personnel and sales efforts.

So far, there have been hundreds of individual topics in the two series of leaflets, with experts in the various fields giving freely of their superior knowledge in order to help educate small businessmen who may not have known of the facts and factors involved. If you have not been receiving these leaflets, which are available at no charge, you should get in touch with the SBA field office closest to you, and ask about getting the back copies, and/or to be put on the mailing list to get future leaflets issued under this program.

Many business owners have reported not only getting a great deal of valid knowledge out of these booklets, but say that they make it a point to pass the leaflets around among their employees, with instructions that each employee read the advice and, insofar as possible, to assimilate the facts contained in the printed material. Literally tens of thousands of small businessmen have found this information helpful.

MANAGEMENT BOOKLETS

In the same general area, SBA for years has been preparing—through the services of experts qualified in the various fields—booklets in its Small Business Management Series. These booklets available from the U.S. Superintendent of Documents for nominal fees (seldom more than \$1), are crammed full of interesting and useful information which every businessman must know if he is to be able to buck the tide of competition and to remain in business in the hurly-burly business world of today.

Typical booklets include "Ratio Analysis for Small Business," "Profitable Small Plant Layout," and "New Product Introduction for Small Business Owners." The trick in using this material—some of which may not seem useful to you—is to read it with the idea of acclimating the advice to your own field. A writer in one of the booklets may tell about trucks and their auxiliary uses, and this might give you some idea about ways you can lease, or rent, your trucks during the periods, or even weekends, when these trucks might be sitting idle and producing no income for you.

If you want to get a list of the booklets already printed by SBA in its Small Business Management Series, you can obtain this at the SBA field office, on request, or by writing to the U.S. Small Business Administration, Washington, D.C.

RESEARCH STUDIES

Another integral part of what the SBA is doing for you is its management-research program, through which it is striving to isolate the various factors, internal and external, which work to hurt or to destroy small businesses.

"There is a great need—among small business owners and managers and those who service small business—for additional knowledge concerning the successful operation of small businesses in all fields," SBA officials declared. The SBA is trying to help by financing small business research studies by college and university researchers, and other professional research organizations. By law, the SBA may finance such projects up to a maximum cost of \$40,000 a year in each of the 50 States."

If there are specific facets, relating to business management, which you feel should be researched, you might get in touch with your State university, or some other educational institution, with the view of having that institution apply for an SBA grant to do the research. Since this \$40,000 for each State is available, and since there are many phases to business operations which still remain puzzling to students and businessmen, you might be doing yourself and the businessmen of the future a great favor by spurring such basic research.

An integral part of SBA's educational program is the agency's sponsorship of management courses with institutions of higher learning in various States. Since the beginning of its administrative management course program in 1954, some 30,000 small businessmen have gone back to school, taking some 938 courses conducted by management experts in more than 300 institutions of higher learning.

Remember, the SBA is operating through your tax money. If there are to be benefits gained from it, it is up to you to learn of them and to use the SBA facilities to the fullest. There's a good chance that, in one way or another, it will pay off.

Why Is the Administration Demanding New Dictatorial Powers in Foreign Aid Financing?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, once again I would like to pose the question I have been asking since the current debate on foreign aid started: Why is the administration demanding new powers for financing foreign aid when Congress has never failed to approve appropriations which have been requested? The following editorial from the Wall Street Journal points out that the Congress has been voting foreign aid funds every year for the past 15 years. The program has never been held up by failure of Congress to act. Yet, the administration now claims that unless more dictatorial power is given to the Executive to bypass Congress, the whole program will fail. Why does the administration want this additional power? Is Congress not entitled to a straightforward answer to this question?

BOUND BY BILLIONS

It's clear enough that the administration won't get the kind of long-term financing of foreign aid loans it wanted. But a fairly obvious defeat is being hailed by some as a moral victory for the White House.

As whipped into shape by a House-Senate conference committee, the aid-financing bill omits the administration scheme of direct Treasury borrowing. Instead, it authorizes loan spending of up to \$7.2 billion over the next 5 years and empowers the administration to make commitments to foreign countries in advance of annual congressional appropriations. This grant of authority, it's said, puts Congress under a new moral commitment to make good U.S. aid promises as they come due.

Congress has committed itself, to be sure. But when in the past 15 years has Congress not been committed to maintaining a U.S. foreign aid program? Wisely or not, Congress has in practice long given U.S. policymakers assurance that foreign aid won't be cut off abruptly.

But Congress is no more bound now than it ever was to give the aid-givers precisely the program they want. For all the talk of aid financing, the debate this year actually was about whether the White House or Congress would set the standards by which U.S. aid is judged. In keeping the check of an-

nual appropriations, Congress has sensibly upheld its right to tell the White House where it's wrong.

And there are plenty of things that can go wrong with the administration's new aid plans. Moreover, many assumptions and practices proved wrong and wasteful in the past remain unchanged. In a sense, the administration has won a considerable victory in convincing a skeptical Congress that new billions ought to be committed on the strength of promised reforms.

So there is indeed a moral commitment involved in the foreign aid program. But it falls squarely on the administration which has promised to Congress and the American people that foreign aid will be wisely spent.

Time and the Calendar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HIRAM L. FONG

OF HAWAII

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, I have introduced today a bill providing for the adoption of the perpetual calendar devised by Dr. Willard E. Edwards of Honolulu. Dr. Edwards is a graduate of the University of Oklahoma and of Jackson College in Honolulu. He is a registered professional engineer and has been employed in Federal civilian and military service since November 1941. He was called into service during World War II and attained the rank of lieutenant commander. He has been a professional licensed radio engineer, science teacher, commercial airlines pilot, and has devoted many years to the study of calendar reform.

I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "Time and the Calendar" written by Dr. Edwards be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TIME AND THE CALENDAR

(By Willard E. Edwards, Litt. D., originator of "The Perpetual Calendar")

The lack of fixity of our present calendar and the inequalities of its divisions are fatal faults. The international use of a more logical arrangement is highly desirable. Such a proposal eventually may be considered by the United Nations. If the adoption of a new civil calendar is then recommended, all countries could benefit by such a decision.

Our present seasonal calendar was considered corrected in 1582 when a fixed date was chosen for spring. The Council of Nicea had met in A.D. 325 when the vernal equinox occurred on March 21. This month-date was therefore chosen for future use as the first day of spring in order to commemorate the council's meeting.

The Julian Calendar averaged 365.2500 days, whereas the solar year is 365.2422 days in length. An annual gain in the calendar of 0.0078 day had thus occurred between A.D. 325 and 1582. By the latter date, spring was arriving on March 11. This was 2 weeks before the beginning of the Christian year at that time. Ten calendar days (October 5-14) were therefore dropped in 1582 to make the next Vernal Equinox occur on March 21, 1583. At the same time, the beginning of the year was moved from March

25 to January 1. These changes were not accepted by Great Britain and her colonies until 1752, and 11 days were then dropped. George Washington, born February 11, 1732, had to wait until February 22, 1753, before he became 21 years old.

A more scientific and humanitarian change would have been the addition of 10 days to February in 1582. This would have allowed the next vernal equinox to come on March 1. That date could then have been made the beginning of the year, as it was formerly. Starting the year at an equinox, when day equals night, is far more logical than at a solstice. In comparison, we usually show a 360° sine wave starting at the zero reference line, not at a plus or minus 90° peak. The four quarters of the sine wave are comparable to the four seasons of the year.

TIME IS A MEASURABLE DURATION

However, the subject of a new starting date for the year has already been studied internationally. It was done at the request of the League of Nations Calendar Committee. All but South Africa were against such a change, and the subject therefore has not been seriously considered since.

Time is a measurement of the earth's rotation on its axis and of its revolution around the sun. The laws of nature determine the length of the solar or tropical year. It is the interval between consecutive returns of the sun to the vernal equinox. This interval is currently decreasing at the rate of about one-half second each century. It is 365 days, 5 hours, 48 minutes, and 45.51 seconds in length of the present time. When this period is reduced to a decimal, it becomes 365.242193402777.

By adopting a new leap-year rule in 1582, the length of the calendar year was reduced. It now averages 365.2425000 days over a period of 400 years. However, subtracting 365.2421934 from 365.2425000 shows that the calendar year is 0.0003066 day greater than the solar year. How many years will it take for the calendar year to get ahead of the solar year by 1 whole day? The answer is found by dividing the figure 1 by the average annual difference. This would give us a period of 3,262 years, provided the present annual difference of 0.0003066 day remained constant.

Instead of the correct figure of 45.51, the number of seconds at the end of the year is often taken as 46.00. Using this larger figure, the length of the solar year would be 365.2421991 days. This is 0.0003009 day less than the calendar year. Dividing the figure 1 by this incorrect annual difference gives 3,323 years instead of 3,262, an error of 61 years.

PRESENT LEAP-YEAR RULE PRACTICAL

Adding 3,262 to the year 1582, it is seen that future generations will not have to correct the calendar again until A.D. 4844. That year would normally be a leap year. But if it is counted as a 365-day year instead, the calendar will then be corrected for another 32 centuries. Surely this is an entirely effective, simple, and practical correction.

Pope Gregory XIII changed the leap-year rule in 1582. Of all the years ending in two zeros, only those divisible by 400 would henceforth be counted as leap years. There are now 97 leap years of 366 days, and 303 years of 365 days every 400 years. This correction of the Julian Calendar gave us our present average calendar year of 365.2425 days. This is accurate enough for all of our ordinary practical purposes. There is no need to change the Gregorian correction for determining the length of the average calendar year.

In fact, astronomy does not require consideration in present calendar revision problems in any way. There are simply two outstanding faults in the current civil calendar. In the first place, it lacks fixity. And

in the second place, its divisions are unequal. Every year starts on a different day of the week, and the lengths of the months, quarters, and half-years are unequal. These two fatal faults result in much inconvenience and great annual expense in the social, economic and business worlds.

THE PERPETUAL CALENDAR CORRECTIONS

But these two faults are corrected in "The Perpetual Calendar," a proposal for a new international standard civil calendar. To obtain fixity this plan (shown herein) begins with "New Year's Day" as a day apart from any week. This is the most logical day for the purpose since it is already a regular international holiday. To obtain equal divisions, it is followed by a 364-day equal-quarter year starting with Monday, January 1. This calendar has 26 working days in each month, plus rest days or Sabbaths, and there are 13 whole weeks in each quarter. Christmas and other proposed holidays fall on Mondays, and the 1st and 15th of all months fall on weekdays. Incidentally, there are no "unlucky" Fridays—the 13th in the entire calendar year.

In leap years, another international holiday is definitely named and accounted for as a day apart. It is called simply "Leap-Year Day," the first day of the second half year. It follows Sunday, June 31 and precedes Monday, July 1. The use of the 2 days apart is the only logical way of revising the calendar to obtain fixity, plus equal monthly and quarterly working periods, and yet keep it within the solar year. Without such revision, any other proposed change becomes impractical.

The majority of those seriously studying the subject consider "The Perpetual Calendar" to be the most practical and sensible 12-month calendar ever devised. It is the simplest proposal for an equal-quarter fixed civil calendar. Its nearest rival was a plan called "The World Calendar." This latter proposal was first presented to the League of Nations by Octavius Smith of Canada in 1925. The association promoting its adoption closed its offices in April 1956.

"The Perpetual Calendar" may be printed with either Sunday or Monday as the first day of the week. However, Saturday and Sunday are already considered as "the weekend" in most countries. Also, the airlines and the majority of schools and businesses consider Monday as the first day of the week. The calendar is regularly printed this way in many European countries.

A NEW CALENDAR RHYME

In "The Perpetual Calendar," the months always begin on significant weekdays; Monday, Wednesday, and Friday. Each quarter of the year has 91 days, with three complete months of 30, 30 and 31 days. To replace the presently-used 400-year-old calendar rhyme of Richard Grafton, the following is given:

With a day apart, the year's begun,
Followed by thirty, thirty, thirty-one.
Months always start a certain way,
On Monday, Wednesday, and Friday.
Each quarter and each year the same,
Is The Perpetual Calendar's aim.

This calendar has been widely endorsed as the most practical 12-month plan ever proposed. Its international adoption will benefit the entire social and economic world. It will save time. Hundreds of thousands of hours are now wasted yearly due to figuring with a shifting and unequal calendar. This present loss occurs in all scheduling and comparison work; and in all business, industrial, and social accounting throughout the civilized world.

ANNUAL LOSS CAN BE PREVENTED

The main point is that once "The Perpetual Calendar" is adopted, its use will be of inestimable value. It will actually save hundreds of thousands of dollars annually.

All insurance and transportation companies; all banking, accounting, and tax people; and all schools and colleges throughout the world will benefit. Also, think how much easier it will be to remember wedding anniversaries and all other annual events. They will always be associated with both a fixed weekday and a monthly date.

The present calendar has been in use about 2,000 years. Yet many nations are in agreement that a new fixed international standard civil calendar is highly desirable. There is only one such plan which has received any official U.S.A. endorsement, and that is "The Perpetual Calendar." It was officially endorsed by the House of Represent-

atives of the Territory of Hawaii in 1943 and by the Legislature of Massachusetts in 1952. Asking for its widespread printing, study, and approval at this time will help greatly toward its eventual international adoption.

Change is the result of natural growth, and no progress is ever made without change. There is nothing to be gained by cherishing or defending our present calendar. It is simply an awkward and expensive heritage from the past. But "The Perpetual Calendar" has both fixity and equality in its divisions. It is an efficient, timesaving, scientific plan. Let's adopt it for our daily international use, especially when it can be done so easily.

THE PERPETUAL CALENDAR

JANUARY	FEBRUARY	MARCH
M T W T F S S	M T W T F S S	M T W T F S S
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3
8 9 10 11 12 13 14	6 7 8 9 10 11 12	4 5 6 7 8 9 10
15 16 17 18 19 20 21	13 14 15 16 17 18 19	11 12 13 14 15 16 17
22 23 24 25 26 27 28	20 21 22 23 24 25 26	18 19 20 21 22 23 24
29 30	27 28 29 30	25 26 27 28 29 30 31
APRIL	MAY	JUNE
M T W T F S S	M T W T F S S	M T W T F S S
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3
8 9 10 11 12 13 14	6 7 8 9 10 11 12	4 5 6 7 8 9 10
15 16 17 18 19 20 21	13 14 15 16 17 18 19	11 12 13 14 15 16 17
22 23 24 25 26 27 28	20 21 22 23 24 25 26	18 19 20 21 22 23 24
29 30	27 28 29 30	25 26 27 28 29 30 31
JULY	AUGUST	SEPTEMBER
M T W T F S S	M T W T F S S	M T W T F S S
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3
8 9 10 11 12 13 14	6 7 8 9 10 11 12	4 5 6 7 8 9 10
15 16 17 18 19 20 21	13 14 15 16 17 18 19	11 12 13 14 15 16 17
22 23 24 25 26 27 28	20 21 22 23 24 25 26	18 19 20 21 22 23 24
29 30	27 28 29 30	25 26 27 28 29 30 31
OCTOBER	NOVEMBER	DECEMBER
M T W T F S S	M T W T F S S	M T W T F S S
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3
8 9 10 11 12 13 14	6 7 8 9 10 11 12	4 5 6 7 8 9 10
15 16 17 18 19 20 21	13 14 15 16 17 18 19	11 12 13 14 15 16 17
22 23 24 25 26 27 28	20 21 22 23 24 25 26	18 19 20 21 22 23 24
29 30	27 28 29 30	25 26 27 28 29 30 31

Labor Day Statement of Industrial Union Department, AFL-CIO

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 21, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of the Industrial Union Department, AFL-CIO:

LABOR DAY STATEMENT OF THE INDUSTRIAL UNION DEPARTMENT, AFL-CIO

The Industrial Union Department, AFL-CIO, extends warm fraternal greetings to free organized labor the world over on this traditional holiday of America's working people. We offer our good will to free men and women the world over. To those held captive in totalitarian bondage in so much of today's world, we pledge our continued efforts in the struggle to extend freedom and human rights.

Industrial labor especially pledges its solidarity to those free workers of Berlin and the West who today stand on the most critical battlefronts against tyranny. The struggle for freedom on these key outposts is our battle. If this struggle is lost, our own freedom to speak out and unite for common cause will be seriously endangered.

Labor Day 1961 comes at a time of grave peril involving the survival of all humanity. It is our hope and our prayer on this holiday of labor that world crisis will be resolved and that peace will truly prevail throughout the world.

Peace without freedom is intolerable. In the battle for peace, we stand foursquare with all who hold life dear. But we stand united and firm on the side of freedom, and we warn all who would extend tyranny that we have fought our way up from wage slavery and we will not retreat.

We urge that the problems now before the world shall be settled through open negotiation. But negotiation cannot and must not mean surrender. Nor can it mean the abandonment of any now free to those who would enslave them or hold them captive in a system to which they are opposed.

The Kremlin has laid down to the free world a challenge and has boasted that it will outstrip and leave us far behind in the next 20 years. Here is a challenge that we of free American labor fully understand.

We accept the Khrushchev challenge gladly and in turn challenge the Kremlin to give the world the opportunity for peaceful competition. We will be happy to permit history to judge which of our worlds is superior so that our children may choose freely the kind they desire.

With the Khrushchev challenge in mind, we point out that all is not well with the American economy and that redoubled effort now is in order to meet the problems of our domestic scene. We reject the argument that America cannot meet her defense

needs without cutting back welfare programs and refusing to meet public needs at home.

We are sadly disappointed at the lack of action on aid to education in the present Congress. We note that the Kremlin 20-year challenge will be as much a challenge on the educational front as it will be to create greater material well-being. We call upon the administration and the congressional leadership to redouble their efforts for a bold education bill.

While applauding the Housing Act passed this year, we call also for a further attack upon the decay now so apparent in our cities. The Soviet challenge will not be met until, as the words of "America, the Beautiful" recite, ours are truly gleaming "alabaster" cities. The rebuilding of our cities cannot be permitted to be limited to new luxury housing and fancy commercial structures. Our cities must become centers in which the average citizen can live, breathe, and gain cultural fulfillment.

The neglect of the health needs of America's elders is as great upon this Labor Day as it was a decade ago. Action here is long overdue. The free world watches how we treat our senior citizens and conscience surely dictates that we shall provide to them the care they have earned through years of toil and contribution to our way of life.

Throughout the current period of economic upturn, joblessness has hovered near the 7-percent mark, despite even new highs of industrial production. Automation is bringing to U.S. industry ever greater man-hour output. It is criminal that this higher productivity should be permitted to cause unemployment.

The serious continuing slack in the U.S. economy is a clear answer to those who would curtail essential domestic civilian programs in the name of defense. With her great wealth and potential for the creation of ever greater wealth, America can well afford to improve the conditions of her people while meeting defense and foreign aid obligations.

Present unemployment is creating a serious drag upon recovery. It would be unthinkable to permit a new recession just when the U.S. economy must be the major bulwark of free world strength. The need now is for selected public works, schools, a broad-scale youth corps at home, and other measures which will create new wealth while providing jobs and economic strength to bolster the defense of the Nation.

While progress has been made in the area of civil rights, the Negro and other minority groups continue to be denied equal citizenship. Freedom and humanity cry out for strong civil rights legislation. Industrial labor pledges its continued support for full civil rights, recognizing that without these its own objectives will not be achieved.

On this Labor Day, we pledge to workers in newly developing nations that we shall do our utmost to aid them in their struggle for adequate livelihoods and effective unions. To this end, industrial labor hails the new Alliance for Progress and stresses that it will do all in its power in support of this great step forward. We pledge also our support and cooperation for continuing programs of effective economic assistance.

Arlington Court Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 16, 1961

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, I believe all of us experience a sensation of

pride and satisfaction when the fine work of good friends receives the recognition it merits. Such is my feeling on learning that the Arlington County (Va.) Traffic Court has been accorded outstanding recognition by the Standing Committee on Traffic Court Program of the American Bar Association.

Its highly prized award is for first place in its population group for improvement in practices and procedures in traffic court cases in 1960.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the letter notifying the Honorable Burton V. Kramer, judge of the Arlington County Court, of this ABA award.

AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION,
STANDING COMMITTEE ON
TRAFFIC COURT PROGRAM,
St. Louis, Mo., August 7, 1961.

HON. BURTON V. KRAMER,
Judge, Arlington County Court,
Arlington, Va.

DEAR JUDGE KRAMER: You are hereby notified that the court over which you presided in 1960-61, has been awarded first place in group VI (100,000-200,000).

This award is based on improvement in practices and procedures in traffic court cases as set forth by you in the 1960 report in the annual inventory of traffic court activities conducted by our association.

We are now ordering the plaque, and it should be available shortly. In the meantime, we would appreciate having you give some consideration to a date after September 11, 1961, which would be appropriate for a ceremony designed to present this award to your court.

Please advise us by letter at your earliest convenience so that we may take steps to select our representative for this purpose.

Sincerely yours,

ALBERT B. HOUGHTON,
Chairman.

J. Edgar Hoover Honored by Resolution of the Tennessee Law Enforcement Officers Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD DAVIS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, Director J. Edgar Hoover enjoys the finest reputation possible in the field of law enforcement. Possessing high character and remarkable ability, he has brought the Federal Bureau of Investigation to a position of respect and authority. The Tennessee Law Enforcement Officers Association, meeting in convention in Nashville, passed a resolution expressing appreciation for his leadership and under leave to extend my remarks, I am including it:

Whereas Tennessee and the entire Nation face the gravest crises of all times because of the startling increase in crime and lawlessness, as evidenced by a national crime increase of 98 percent in the past decade, with a 14-percent increase in 1960 over 1959, and with a total of 1,861,300 serious offenses committed in 1960, and

Whereas the forces of law enforcement are meeting the challenge as evidenced by the fact that 71 percent more cases were cleared by arrests, 65 percent more persons were arrested, and 42 percent more court convictions resulted in 1960, as compared to 1950, and

Whereas the professionalization of law enforcement through better personnel, more efficient equipment, continued intensified training, and increased recognition and support of citizens has been achieved, and

Whereas the Honorable J. Edgar Hoover has for over 37 years dedicated himself and the Federal Bureau of Investigation to the professionalization of law enforcement in America, and has made available the entire facilities of the FBI for that purpose, and for the struggle of law enforcement against lawlessness and crime: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the Tennessee Law Enforcement Officers Association and its individual members rededicate themselves to the fight against crime and lawlessness and express to the Honorable J. Edgar Hoover the appreciation and continued support of this association and its members.

Rightwing Radicals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DALE ALFORD

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. ALFORD. Mr. Speaker, I have warned before of the repeated attacks being made on patriotic Americans whose only desire is to safeguard and protect their country. In recent days, Mr. Karr Shannon, author of the column "Run of the News," which is published in the Arkansas Democrat in Little Rock, Ark., has written an article entitled "Those Warnings Against Rightwing Radicals." Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a copy of this article:

THOSE WARNINGS AGAINST RIGHTWING RADICALS

(By Karr Shannon)

Arkansas' Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT has become alarmed at what he regards as the preaching of rightwing radicalism by military officers in various information programs. Some of the Nation's other statesmen and some of our newspaper editors have also voiced such alarm. Mr. FULBRIGHT sent a private memorandum to President Kennedy and Defense Secretary McNamara deploring the alleged rightwing radicalism, but was mum on leftwing radicalism, Communist infiltration, et cetera.

The brave chief of the New Frontier and his liberal advisers, like the Arkansas Senator, are simply appalled by the rightist preaching of certain military officers—they have issued a directive commanding officers to cease and desist such evangelism, to submit to "policy guidance" in their participation in educational programs reaching any part of the public.

Mr. FULBRIGHT and the editors et al. contend that there are unwarranted fears in this land of the fleeced and home of the brave relative to Communist subversion in government and in other avenues.

Would they have us forget Alger Hiss, Harry Dexter White, Lauchlin Currie and the other undermining characters of the New

Deal and Fair Deal? Do they want us to forget Truman's "red herring" philosophy?

Mr. FULBRIGHT, a statesman and scholar, also deplored a tendency to attribute international difficulties to our softness toward communism, policies of appeasement, forgetting, so it seems, Teheran, Yalta, Potsdam, the Communist conquest of China, the Korean war. Nor did he get around to mentioning the United Nations farce. He just left the general impression that anybody who objects to anything sponsored or proposed by the New Deal, Fair Deal, or New Frontier was a "rightwing radical."

We are in a cold war. The chief strategy of Communists is to take over a nation from within. This was the formula set forth by Karl Marx, founder of the theories of present-day communism and the forerunner of Lenin, Trotsky, Stalin, and Khrushchev. Communism's greatest advancement is built on the chaos and misery that come with dissension, pitting class against class, confusion.

INTOLERANCE OF LIBERALS

The intolerance of the liberals, ultra-liberals and half-baked Socialists appears to be far more pronounced than any expression or philosophy emanating from conservatives.

Maj. Gen. Edwin A. Walker was lambasted because he tried to teach his troops something about the cold war we are waging with communism and how they might fight for our rights in such war. Heavy criticism has been directed at the film, "Operation Abolition," intended to document what is common knowledge—that the Reds are out to destroy the House Committee on Un-American Activities. The liberals have also turned their fire on Dr. George Benson, president of Harding College, and the crusade of the National Education program. The film, "Communism on the Map," which depicts the strategy and gains of communism, has come in for a shellacking because, so the liberals say, it is causing "unnecessary hysteria."

HEMINGWAY AND CHAMBERS

It was coincidental that Ernest Hemingway, the Pulitzer Prize winning and Nobel Prize winning author, and Whittaker Chambers, Communist turned American, died at about the same time. Hemingway stood for substantially nothing. He never endorsed anything good or condemned anything bad. Chambers produced the evidence to convict Alger Hiss. He wrote an expose of communism, "The Witness," which was widely read. Hemingway's overcoat wouldn't make Chambers a toe-rag. But Hemingway was eulogized in newspaper editorials across the land, while Chambers was scarcely mentioned.

Does this differentiation between respect for two famous men represent modern America's attitude toward people who risk their lives and fortunes to fight communism from within?

There is a ceaseless fight against the John Birch Society, which is doing nothing more than pointing up the Communist menace—and fighting it wherever found. This organization has begged to be investigated by any congressional committee. If it is un-American, why not an investigation?

WHY? WHY?

Why should any person, civilian or military, be condemned for fighting communism from within as well as fighting it on the battlefields? Why should we condone one type of Communist strategy and fight the other? Why should we send billions of dollars abroad to keep Communists from taking other countries from within and, at the same time, ignore or ridicule such operation in our own country?

When an American becomes a high officer in the military, does he, as a consequence, lose his constitutional right of freedom of speech?

Is a conservative American without honor in his own country? Has the reactionary become a criminal?

Is it wrong for a college to teach Americanism?

Leave it alone and it will go away. That may be good tactics in dealing with a rattlesnake, but not with the Communist menace, which is worse than a jillion rattlesnakes.

Chaotic Sugar Trade War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Daily News of August 29, 1961:

CHAOTIC SUGAR TRADE WAR

(By Peter Edson)

Soviet Russia is now believed to have moved into the position of being able to conduct an international trade war in sugar, controlling world prices and markets. The situation is being closely watched by U.S. sugar interests.

The development arises through Russia's barter purchase of 4 million tons of Cuban production and through the still more important fact that Russia is now the world's largest sugar producer. Its output this year is believed to be 7 million tons. Cuba will be second with 6 million tons.

Accurate data are not available, but there are industry reports that Russia built 50 refineries last year and has plans to build another 100. This indicates a growth potential.

Sugar is a high heat and energy food considered desirable in cold Russia. Sugar is not rationed, except by government control of prices. These have run as high as 50 cents to \$1 a pound. This yields a nice capitalistic profit to the Communists particularly on the sugar Russia gets from Cuba.

There has been some speculation that Russia finances much of its agricultural expansion on sugar profits. Any over supply it can dump on world markets at ruinous prices.

In what is unquestionably one of the worst deals the Castro-Guevarra regime has made, Cuba gets paid in cash for only 20 percent of the sugar Russia gets. For the other 80 percent, Cuba must take in barter whatever Russia wants to supply—jet planes or caviar—at prices determined by Russia.

The ineffectiveness of this deal may be shown by Castro's desire to trade prisoners for U.S. tractors. It was an open admission Russia wasn't supplying what Cuba wants most.

One other sore spot for Cuba is that some of the sugar Russia takes may be leaking to the world market through Czechoslovakia at reduced prices. This violates the agreement. Cuban white sugar is now obtainable in Europe at prices below Cuba's raw sugar price.

If the Russians are double-crossing their Cuban ally in this way, it would explain Castro's and Guevarra's repeated overtures to the United States for a resumption of sugar sales to this country.

Just what's going on in this tremendously complicated business may be revealed in part at the forthcoming International Sugar Council meeting which opens in Geneva, Switzerland, September 12. U.S. Govern-

ment and sugar industry representatives will attend. ISC is a United Nations commodity subsidiary of 29 exporting and 9 importing countries with many observers.

Exporting and importing countries have relatively equal votes, and its decisions are usually unanimous. Russia with 95 votes, Hungary with 15 and Czechoslovakia with 245 votes have been exporter members for 12 years. They have been generally cooperative though they haven't given much information on their own production and consumption.

The United States and Britain are principal importing countries with 245 votes each. Russia, importing 4 million tons this year, could qualify as the biggest importer, but prefers to be designated an exporter.

ISC negotiated a 5-year agreement in 1958 but provided that it could be reviewed after 3 years. This job will be complicated by world market changes resulting from the Cuban situation, new high levels of world sugar production, currently depressed prices and uncertainty over future U.S. sugar policy.

Existing U.S. sugar law expires June 30, 1962. Before that time, Congress must determine what to do with the 3-million-ton allotment formerly given to Cuba but now distributed to 21 other producing countries.

Captives of East Berlin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Berlin crisis is destined to remain with us for sometime, and the action of the Soviet Union in having its East German puppets seal off the citizens of East Germany from freedom is certainly action which cannot be condoned by responsible leaders or public opinion in the free world.

The people of East Germany, and for that matter, the people behind the Iron Curtain and the Russian people themselves are rightfully classified as captives of communism.

Mr. Speaker, one of the outstanding semiweekly publications in my district, the Chicago Heights Star, in its edition of Thursday, August 29, discussed the issue of East Germany in an especially penetrating manner. Under leave granted, I include in the RECORD this editorial entitled "Captives of East Berlin":

CAPTIVES OF EAST BERLIN

A favorite theme, some years ago, of those who looked kindly on socialism and communism was that while America was the land of plenty, it would be the land of even greater plenty under such a system. If the standard of living happened to be lower in a socialist country—as it indeed was—this was attributed to a lack of natural resources.

In the light of this, it is interesting to observe that Mr. Khrushchev has found it necessary to close the door on residents of East Berlin in order to halt their flight to West Berlin. Communist East Berliners are now living in something of an open air penitentiary.

It is incredible that East Berlin could have had substantially fewer natural resources

than West Berlin when the city was parceled out among the victors in World War II. Mr. Stalin, having been able to sell his allies on virtually everything else, certainly would not have accepted the less promising sector of the municipality.

Yet collectivism and other communistic schemes in the Red sector have given its residents little more than an urge to travel—beyond its borders to prosperous, capitalistic West Berlin.

It might be hoped that a lesson will be drawn from this, not only by dreamers of dreams in the United States but by the uncommitted nations of the world.

And if East Berlin's plight can be traced in part to siphoning off of its assets by the Russians, the lesson to be learned by the uncommitted nations should be even more valuable.

In any event, we hope the world at large has taken note of recent events at the border.

Address of Mayor Sam Ridley, Smyrna, Tenn., Before American Municipal Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Sam Ridley, mayor of Smyrna, one of the fine cities I have the honor to represent in the Congress, recently addressed the 38th annual meeting of the American Municipal Association in Seattle, Wash.

Mayor Ridley in his address on "Federal Aid and the Small City" pointed out many of the programs through which the Federal and local governments cooperate to provide improved service to the citizens of the local community.

The mayor states that while many people think of various Federal programs as providing assistance primarily to the big cities this is not necessarily true. He shows by several examples that the present Federal aid programs as enacted by the Congress provide much needed help for cities both big and little.

The remarks of Mayor Ridley are most interesting and contain many good examples of how our Federal programs are being used effectively in Tennessee.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the remarks of Mayor Ridley be reprinted in the RECORD.

The address follows:

[From the Daily News Journal, Murfreesboro, Tenn., Aug. 24, 1961]

RIDLEY LAUDS FEDERAL AID AT SEATTLE—CITES WAYS THAT GOVERNMENT CAN HELP ALL AREAS

John Sam Ridley, mayor of Smyrna, is scheduled to address the 38th annual American Municipal Association on August 26, 1961.

Mayor Ridley left Tuesday morning for Seattle, Wash., where the Congress is meeting. He will discuss Federal aid and the small city.

His speech follows:

"It is a rare privilege to address this group of experts in government on one phase of

intergovernmental cooperation—Federal aid to local governments.

"I understand President Hummel wanted one of the speakers to represent smaller municipalities. Regardless of my other qualifications, I believe I fill the bill on that. My hometown of Smyrna is the best in Tennessee, but with a population of 3,600 it certainly is not the biggest.

"As mayor of Smyrna for over 14 years, and as a former president and member of the Federal Committee of the Tennessee Municipal League, I have gained some knowledge of Federal grant-in-aid programs. I like what I have learned.

"Some people today have the attitude that anything Federal is somehow evil. They seem to think the Federal Government is a menace, a monster, awaiting a chance to gobble them up. They have nightmares about socialism, and loss of individual freedoms to what they call big government or an all-powerful centralized government.

I am not one of them. And it is interesting to note that most of these people, when pinned down, do not object very much to any Federal Government activity which benefits them. It's the project helping the people in the next county, or over in the next State, that is leading us all down the primrose path to socialism.

I for one, as a small city mayor, am not petrified with fear or blinded by suspicion in connection with the activities of the Federal Government. The people who operate the Federal Government are public servants, just as I am. Many of my personal friends are in Federal employment. I voted for some of the people who are in Congress, and I would vote for them again.

And I don't think election to Federal office makes the successful candidate start scheming about how he can destroy my individual freedoms. It is true that some of the people elected to the Congress seem to require a little larger hat size after being up there for a while. But they can always be replaced—and they know this better than anyone else.

It is extremely helpful, also, to have organizations such as our league and the American Municipal Association to keep the people in Federal Government constantly aware of our interests.

I did not mean to make this sound like a defense of the Federal Government, although in some quarters it appears that there is a real need for loyal citizens of the United States of America to rise to their feet occasionally with a kind word for our National Government—especially since its enemies abroad have it under constant criticism and dangerous attack.

To me, the Federal Government is one of several governments which serve me, and the people of Smyrna. I like to feel that the Federal Government does just about what the people want it to do—and what it can do better than other levels of government. I think this is true of the municipal government of Smyrna. And to me this is real freedom, true liberty, and good government.

As our country has filled up with people, and as our complex and truly national economy has developed, we have had to make some basic decisions about what we wanted Government to do.

It is obvious that we need a nationwide network of highways, and the secondary and feeder roads serving the communities off the main highways.

It is obvious that we need a nationwide system of airports, along with airports in the smaller communities to serve local requirements.

Two major questions confronted us in connection with these and other issues demanding some kind of governmental action.

The first question was: Can this activity be supported successfully out of municipal tax revenues when all local tax bases are naturally and severely limited?

The second question was: If these activities are important to the Nation as a whole, shall we have vast Federal departments which own and control them, or shall we use our State and local governments to the fullest as the administrative agencies, the democratic units of government which keep effective control of these activities as close to the people as possible?

Wisely, and in the true American tradition, we have chosen not to nationalize these great programs, but to decentralize their administration and control.

Although the Federal Government has put up 50 percent of the money for so-called Federal highways, and is providing 90 percent of the Interstate System cost, the highways are owned and controlled by the State and local governments.

Although the Federal Government has been providing 50 percent of the money for airport construction and expansion projects, the airports are owned and operated by the cities.

Some larger cities probably could go it alone on their commercial airport programs if they were forced into it although at a tremendous financial strain. But the smaller airports—such as the 40 small locally owned airports in Tennessee outside our metropolitan areas—must have assistance to stay alive.

By the same token, the local governments must have highways to survive but they do not have the financial resources or the jurisdiction to enter into the highway construction business all by themselves.

Without assistance from Federal and State Governments, these small communities, now served by adequate highways, and now able to enjoy a moderate amount of air service, would still be stuck in the mud.

The principle is just as true in Federal-State-local cooperation. The local community, the municipal government, can serve its citizens best by using the superior levels of government as supplemental tax collectors. The municipalities of Tennessee have demanded both State assistance and home rule and we have both. The State of Tennessee returns to local governments in one form or another about two-thirds of its total tax collections amounting to some \$50 million last year.

The central objective of the Tennessee Municipal League in both State and Federal legislative policy has been this:

To maintain maximum home rule and local self-government and to accomplish this by encouraging both the State and Federal Governments to turn over to municipalities the administration and control of everything the municipal governments are big enough to handle.

We have believed that government under the democratic process works just as well at the local level as at any other level. Therefore, we have urged that government should be concentrated for its control and administration in our municipal governments, which are closest to the people.

Despite the vast size of Federal programs, the small city need not feel left out or insignificant.

Consider Tennessee. We have some 250 municipalities, but only 23 have more than 10,000 population; only 8 have more than 25,000; only 4 have more than 100,000.

Does this mean we have a limited interest, and derive a limited benefit, from Federal grant, loan and assistance programs? Quite the contrary.

Some people think of urban renewal as a big city program. But more than 20 Tennessee municipalities are engaged in urban renewal. Three-fourths of them have less than 25,000 population. These small cities have 31 urban renewal projects underway. More than \$67 million in Federal funds have been reserved to complete these projects. And in the 1961 Housing Act, Congress con-

sidered the financial limitations of small cities by providing three-fourths Federal grants for urban renewal in cities under 50,000, and only two-thirds grants in larger cities.

Some people think of low-rent public housing as a big-city program. In Tennessee, 73 municipalities are involved in the public housing program through 57 local public housing authorities. Nearly 20,000 dwellings are in operation, under construction or under contributions contract.

One of these Tennessee municipalities is New Tazewell: population 808.

I will admit that New Tazewell is near a larger city, which also is in the housing program. That larger city is Tazewell—population 1,263.

The Federal urban planning assistance program, of course, is aimed directly at the small city which cannot have its own full-time planners. In Tennessee, more than \$830,000 has been authorized to assist local planning. Approximately 65 small communities were aided through grants amounting to \$560,000, and \$235,000 was allocated for regional and metropolitan planning.

Another program of exclusive benefit to small communities is the public facility loan program. Since it was renewed in 1955, Tennessee communities have obtained 35 loans amounting to more than \$15 million. Most of them were for water distribution systems.

As you know, the Housing Act of 1961 provides an additional \$500 million for this extremely helpful program, and lowers the interest rate to 3½ percent or 3 percent in officially designated redevelopment areas. It is a small-city program, limited to communities under 50,000.

The Federal interest-free advances to local governments to help finance public works planning can mean the difference between success or failure of a local project. About 20 Tennessee communities have been aided by this program. Advances have totaled more than \$280,000.

Another outstanding example of small city-Federal cooperation is the water pollution control program. Grants are limited to a maximum of \$600,000 thus directing these funds to small cities.

At least 13 Tennessee cities, and possibly 17, can expect to obtain help for sewage treatment plant projects during this fiscal year. Some of them are totally and completely unable to move in this critical area without outside assistance.

I might mention in passing that one of the Tennessee municipalities which have obtained help from the water pollution control program is Sharon, population 966.

The Federal Aid programs returned nearly \$155 million to Tennessee during fiscal 1960. I am convinced that our smaller municipalities got their equitable shares of this money, perhaps more than their share based on population alone. And it was more important to them than to larger, more nearly self-sufficient units of government.

I frankly doubt that any of these programs were carried out over the sincere opposition of any sizable segment of any community. The Federal Government does not force these programs upon anyone. They are available. They are valuable. Cities may use them if they so choose.

Some people make their strongest argument against all Federal aid programs except of course, the ones that benefit them directly, on the charge that money sent to Washington shrinks to almost nothing by the time it gets back to the local community.

What are the facts?

The House Government Operations Committee has reported that it costs about 44 cents to collect \$100 in Federal taxes. But it costs 95 cents to \$2.34 to collect \$100 in State taxes.

British Fiscal Management**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF****HON. CHARLES RAPER JONAS**

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record, I include the following editorial published by the Charlotte Observer in its issue of July 28, 1961.

Faced with a sharp drop in gold reserves and foreign currency and, at the same time, confronted by the present national emergency, the British have instituted an austerity program designed to promote sound fiscal management at a time of serious crisis.

The editorial very wisely points out that the self-discipline so admirably displayed by the British should serve as a good example to our own administration which, in the face of a national emergency, insists upon pursuing a profligate domestic spending program calculated to fan the flames of inflation:

UNITED STATES COULD WELL AFFORD SOME
BRITISH SELF-DENIAL

With the remarkable maturity and self-discipline displayed so often in the past, Great Britain has just announced a new belt-tightening austerity program.

Its highlights:

A 10-percent increase in excise and customs taxes affecting cigarettes, intoxicating beverages, autos, home appliances, and all luxury goods.

A hold-the-line policy on all wages and salaries.

A capital gains tax to discourage stock market and real estate speculation.

A possible reduction in farm support prices.

Tighter control of homebuilding loans and all forms of construction.

Firmer control of loans for installment buying.

A hold-the-line policy on British aid to underdeveloped nations.

A reduction of 20 percent in foreign spending.

An increase from 5 to 7 percent in the bank rate.

The program brings to an end a decade of "Tory prosperity," probably the best years the British people have ever enjoyed. It was dictated by internal economic ills and a sharp drop in British reserves of gold and foreign currency.

For centuries, Britain has lived by trade, importing raw materials and selling finished goods in the markets of the world.

But the tide of prosperity has been running out in the last few years, so strongly that Britain has finally abandoned its traditional aloofness from continental entanglements and entered the European Common Market.

Britain had little other choice. In the past 5 years, Britain's gross national product grew by only 12 percent as compared with 33 percent in West Germany and Italy. In 10 years, worker productivity has gone up 20 percent in Britain and 55 percent in the Common Market nations. Britain's share of world markets has fallen sharply and even in the British Commonwealth, where Britain has tariff advantages, her exports have increased by only 5 percent in the past 5 years as compared to an increase of 60 percent in

sales to Commonwealth nations by the Common Market.

Because Britain is an island dependent upon trade, its economic problems cannot be compared with those of the United States.

Yet the effect is basically the same. Because of ever higher wage demands, low worker productivity and out-of-date factories, Britain has been pricing itself out of the world markets. British export prices have risen 10 percent in the past 7 years whereas Common Market export prices have increased only 2 percent.

If the parallel between Britain and the United States is inexact, there is nonetheless a lesson for us in Britain's economic distress. We, too, have been pricing ourselves out of the world markets and we will continue to do so unless we apply enough national self-discipline to hold back inflation.

President Kennedy strongly implied in his recent address that our economy is strong enough to afford the new and heavier burden of military preparedness plus all of the high-cost domestic programs he has advanced without starting another inflationary spiral.

The record of history does not supply that view and if the President himself is not willing to advocate some measure of restraint and austerity in domestic spending during the current national emergency, then the Congress should use its power over the public purse to that effect.

**Vowing She Would Ne'er Consent,
Consented****EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF****HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, I was very pleased, today, to give my support to the adoption of the conference report on S. 1983—the foreign aid authorization bill. Although the final product, which combines long-term authorizations with the annual appropriation process, is being hailed in some quarters as representing a "moral victory" for the administration, I would chose to regard it, instead, as a considerable moral victory—and a victory for commonsense, too—for those of us in the House who have worked toward this very compromise.

It is true that, in a sense, Congress has now committed itself to maintaining a vigorous foreign aid program over the next 5 years, but we have retained our constitutional duty to oversee the proper expenditure of such committed funds, and it would, therefore, be more realistic to say that whatever "moral commitment" may be involved falls more heavily on the administration which has heretofore promised both the Congress and the people that, from here on out, foreign aid moneys will be wisely spent.

I am also pleased to note, after all the dire predictions of "doom and gloom" that emanated from the White House about what would happen if the President was not given the borrowing authority he said he needed, that the President now terms the compromise repre-

sented by this conference report as being a "wholly satisfactory" one.

Arthur Krock, writing in today's New York Times, gives an interesting analysis of the manner in which that compromise was arrived at in the following column, which I herewith set forth under leave to extend my remarks:

VOWING SHE WOULD NE'ER CONSENT,
CONSented

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, August 30.—It takes a lot to surprise Senator BYRD of Virginia where events in the arena of politics are concerned. But even he must have rubbed his eyes when he read last night's White House statement that the agreement of the House-Senate conferees on the modus operandi for long-term development loans in the foreign aid program was wholly satisfactory to the President.

For the conferees agreed on a 5-year authorization of the President to make development loan commitments in a total of \$7.2 billions, with an actual appropriation of \$1.2 billions for fiscal 1962, but subject to annual appropriations by Congress. But what the President had fought for to the finish was a Treasury borrowing credit of \$8.8 billion over 5 years, entirely freed of the restraint of the annual appropriation procedure of Congress. And the administration had proclaimed with one voice that this delegation of Congress power of the purse was absolutely indispensable to the viability of the development loan program.

SURPRISE FOR SENATOR BYRD

But there was a more personal factor of surprise for Senator BYRD in the White House announcement. The President had successfully used extraordinary pressures to defeat a Byrd amendment which gave him the same 5-year authorization to commit the full \$8.8 billions he sought for development loans, \$1.6 billion more than the conferees authorized, subject only to the same annual appropriation procedure of Congress the conferees imposed.

The White House explained this about-face on the differing phraseology of the conference report and the Byrd amendment, asserting that the latter "recognized the necessity for this Government to give assurance that assistance will continue to be forthcoming over a period of years." On this wholly semantic argument the administration based its rating of the conference report as "wholly satisfactory" in contrast with the Byrd amendment. But the following text of the amendment invites the conclusion that this was a tactical move to cover an enforced retreat:

"There is hereby authorized to be appropriated [supplied] to the President for use in carrying out [the long-term development loans program] such sums, not to exceed \$1,187 million for use beginning in the fiscal year 1962, and not to exceed \$1,900 million for use beginning in the fiscal years 1963 through 1966, as the Congress shall determine to be necessary, which amounts shall remain available until expended."

THINGS EQUAL TO THE SAME THING

One is as clear a Congressional statement of intent as the other. And the practical restraint imposed by Congress retention of the power of the purse is precisely the same in the conferees' language—"subject only to the annual appropriation of such funds"—as in Byrd's language—"as the Congress shall determine to be necessary," because each specifies an authorized 5-year commitment total in annual amounts. Except that Byrd's total increases the amount authorized. This fundamental similarity, including the rejection by both of the President's basic request for foreclosed 5-year Treasury

borrowing authority, was generally acknowledged here today, as for example this comment by the Evening Star: "The compromise finally agreed upon its virtually identical with the Byrd amendment."

For his own part, Senator Byrd observed that the conferees' report and its acceptance by the President vindicated the efforts of himself, the House Republicans, and some others, to preserve to Congress the right to appropriate, and assured that each year's appropriation for development loans committed would be properly expended. But he wondered with many others why, and on what counsel, the President had been induced to climb out so far on a weak limb from which his retreat had to be made in full public view.

In such circumstances as these, however, the dire consequences so freely prophesied rarely materialize. The administration of foreign aid, particularly of development loan projects, will probably be greatly improved by the refusal of Congress to relinquish its only effective power of review of Government spending. The President's leadership will suffer no serious permanent damage from his defeat, and even may usefully impel him to reappraise the judgment of some advisers. And the principle of long-term development planning has been salvaged by Congress from the blunders of its advocates.

Foresight Is Better Than Hindsight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a recent able, thoughtful, and timely editorial from Gist Research, by Frederick Burdick, setting forth his views on keeping the peace:

FORESIGHT IS BETTER THAN HINDSIGHT
(By Frederick Burdick)

The old saying that "an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure" holds true today as in the past. It applies particularly to the Berlin situation, where each day there are reports of near armed conflicts between forces of the West and those of the East. Interviews with Congressmen show that it is the consensus of the Nation's lawmakers that quick action should be taken to keep the opposing forces apart at a safe distance.

Another basic reason for such action is that under present circumstances it is conceivable that misjudgment or recklessness on the part of military commanders could plunge the world into the worst war in history, one that might destroy not only civilization but humanity. It is well to keep in mind that the Constitution specifically gives to Congress the power to declare or decide on war, not the military.

Another important factor to remember in the present crisis is that world public opinion is overwhelmingly for peace and against war and all that it stands for in destruction, death and human misery. America can help win the hearts and minds of people everywhere by pursuing peace-preserving policies.

Should the Berlin situation worsen and become a still greater threat to world peace, the issue should be taken to the United Nations without delay before incidents develop into catastrophic conflicts. Another al-

ternative is to start negotiating without further delaying or face-saving tactics so that problems may be solved around the conference table instead of tragically multiplied and complicated on bloody battlefields.

Navy Inventor To Be Bounced

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the Members will recall that several weeks ago I placed in the RECORD a series of newspaper articles by Mr. Robert E. Hoyt, of the Knight newspapers, dealing with the controversy surrounding the Wagmicht/VTOL weapons system. At that time, I noted that the Navy appeared to be mishandling the affair in attempting to silence Capt. Cooper Bright. In a recent article by Mr. Hoyt, which appeared in the Detroit Free Press, August 4, 1961, it was reported that Captain Bright has been given a year to resign or be forced out of the Navy. Whether or not this has any connection with his controversial inventions remains to be seen.

So that the Members may keep themselves informed of developments in this matter, I insert this article, under unanimous consent in the Appendix of the RECORD.

NAVY BOUNCING ARDENT BACKER OF NEW AIRCRAFT

(By Robert E. Hoyt)

WASHINGTON.—The Navy is getting rid of Capt. Cooper B. Bright, despite encouraging prospects of Wagmicht, his controversial concept for a collapsible missile/aircraft.

It has been learned that Bright was "selected out" of the Navy by a recent Continuation Board. He has a year to resign or be forced out of the service.

The captain has been a thorn in the Navy's side for the last 3 years. He headed a 1958 study group that came up with the Wagmicht concept to make every ship in the Navy a carrier of collapsed planes and missiles.

Several times the project has been revived after hostile Navy carrier brass thought they had stopped it.

The current evaluation of Wagmicht was ordered May 26 about the "silencing" of Bright. He had been forbidden to discuss the project with anyone, on duty or off duty. The study has not yet been completed.

Bright has no comment to make on the action of the Continuation Board. He says, however, "I intend to spend the next year proving that Wagmicht is the best thing that ever happened to the Navy."

The latest blow to Bright comes at a time when his hopes for Wagmicht are higher than ever. During June and part of July he worked under the direction of Dr. James H. Wakelin, Assistant Navy Secretary for Research and Development, preparing the new proposal.

The potential of Wagmicht as a V/TOL (vertical takeoff and landing) aircraft was increased greatly during the preparation. The "lift" capacity from air stored in the wings is 10 times greater than under earlier proposals.

The board which "scuttled" Bright was headed by Vice Adm. Page Smith, commander in chief of Naval Forces, Europe.

Similar boards twice passed over Adm. Hyman Rickover, "father" of the atomic submarine, who was then promoted by Congress to save him from forced retirement.

The board headed by Smith met between July 5 and 19, first to select officers for advancement, then to cut down certain Navy classes by forced retirement. Navy jargon labels this second function the "plucking" board.

Smith's board "plucked" 152 captains, 35 percent of the classes of 1937 and 1938.

The actions of the "plucking" boards are always highly secret. The names of the captains are not released. The board gives no reason for its action. Because it is partly a face-saving device the names seldom are learned.

Captains "selected out" are given a year's notice, during which time they may file a letter of resignation to avoid the stigma of being "fired."

Bright was "fired" before his work on the latest refinement of Wagmicht was finished. He completed his most recent proposal on July 18.

This report has been sent for evaluation to the Bureau of Weapons which is to be assisted by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

In addition, Dr. Wakelin is sending the Wagmicht proposal to Dr. Harold Brown, Director of Defense Department Research and Engineering.

Before his work under Wakelin, Bright estimated it was possible to get about 4,500 pounds of "lift" from the use of compressed air in the wings.

With the aid of engineers from the General Electric, the "lift" potential has been increased to more than 50,000 pounds.

This lifting power would be in addition to the lift from a jet engine which power the plane in flight. The use of the compressed air would eliminate the need for a second "lifting" engine. Returning from a target the pilot could build up air pressure in the wings with an "accumulator," to provide an airstream cushion for vertical descent.

West Scores Three Big Victories Over Reds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, as the cold war continues it is increasingly important to portray to the rest of the world and in particular to the uncommitted nations the true advantages of democracy over communism. This is made difficult at times because of the barrage of Soviet propaganda that is inflicted upon many of the nations of the world. However, the Western nations do win propaganda victories and recently we have scored three important ones.

Newspaper Columnist Ray Tucker has pointed these victories out in a recent column which appeared in the Cookeville Citizen, an excellent newspaper in Cookeville, Tenn., in the district I have the honor to represent in the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this column be reprinted in the Appendix of the Record. The column follows:

WEST SCORES THREE BIG VICTORIES OVER REDS
(By Ray Tucker)

WASHINGTON.—Soviet propagandists have scored many victories over the West in recent years. Western frankness, honesty, and naivete have made democratic nations suckers for the devious Communists.

But the last 10 days, the West has gained three tremendous propaganda triumphs. And, interestingly enough, these victories were handed to the West by Communists themselves.

These are our victories gained:

1. The Communists' encirclement of West Berlin. This act told the world that thousands of Germans could not stand life under communism; it told the world that force was necessary to keep people in bondage to communism. The risks people have taken to escape to West Germany have let the world know that some people believe death is better than life under communism.

The concrete barricades, described in news stories and on radio, and pictured in photos and on television, are concrete evidence that force is needed to hold people prisoners of communism.

It confirms in a highly dramatic way the West's statement that, given a choice, people will choose democracy over communism.

2. The defection of Dr. Mikhail A. Klovko, prize-winning Soviet scientist. When Dr. Klovko asked asylum in Canada, he confirmed what the West has been saying for 15 years.

Dr. Klovko, 59, winner of a Stalin prize and the Order of Lenin, defected because, he said, he is "seeking freedom of scientific expression denied him in Russia." He is seeking, he added, "to save what is left of my human self-respect."

His defection is of extreme importance to Western propaganda because the Soviets have boasted how well off their scientists are.

3. The defection of Capt. Jorge Navarre and 10 members of the crew of the Cuban ship *Bahia de Nipe* in the Chesapeake Bay. They, too, said life under the hammer and sickle is unbearable.

The significance of these events is being drilled into the ears of neutral listeners by the Voice of America.

The Communists are beginning to understand the size and importance of the victories they have handed to us. This is shown by the frantic effort of Communist propagandists to stir up countering and diverting propaganda.

Communist propagandists are now accusing "agents of the American bacteriological warfare bureau" of being responsible for a cholera epidemic in South China, where 30,000 persons are reported to have died.

They are accusing the West of making plans to kill millions of people in Iran, Pakistan, and Afghanistan to create a "scorched earth" barrier to the Russians in event of a war.

The Honorable Eugene J. Keogh

SPEECH
OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to join with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in extending con-

gratulations to a very able and very popular Member of this body, the gentleman from New York, EUGENE J. KEOGH. GENE KEOGH, as he is known to all of us, has reached an important milestone in his life and in his service to the Nation: a quarter century of devoted service as a Member of the House of Representatives. This anniversary also coincides with his birthday.

GENE KEOGH is a dear friend of mine of long standing. His district in Brooklyn borders on my district. I have collaborated with him ever since I first came to Congress in 1950. If I am any kind of a legislator, it has been due to his wise counsel and his guidance over these years. I have found him to be courteous in every respect, a keen analyst of the American political scene, and a capable parliamentarian. We, in Brooklyn, are very proud of his record and his achievements in Congress over the past 25 years.

I want to wish for him many more years of continued service to the people of his district and to the Nation as a whole. I want to wish him also continued good health and happiness in life, together with his charming and lovely wife, Virginia, and his children. May the future be as rewarding to him as the past.

Health Care for the Aged: Insurance and Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, earlier in this session of the 87th Congress, the House Ways and Means Committee once again studied the problem of the health care costs of persons over 65 and once again heard the proponents and opponents of the social security approach to financing these costs present their views on this proposal. One of the important points of controversy in the hearings, as it has been for some time, was the question of what is being done in the private sector of the economy to meet the needs which our older citizens face in financing their medical care. This problem, as I have pointed out before, is one of success and not failure; the problem arises because we have done so well, we have given the people of our society 10 or 15 years longer to live by our advances in the medical field and the needs come because this success was unforeseen at the time these people were planning for their retirement.

The private sector of the economy has been very active in this field of providing for the needs of our older people. I should like to cite two major areas of activity in this field—private health insurance and provision by industry for health benefits for retired workers. On the former, I am inserting the title page, table of contents, and introduction of a new booklet which has been prepared

by the Health Insurance Institute on guaranteed lifetime health insurance for persons both over 65 and under that age:

REPORT ON GUARANTEED LIFETIME HEALTH INSURANCE FOR PERSONS OVER 65, FOR PERSONS UNDER 65

(By Health Insurance Institute)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Senior citizen hospital-surgical group and group approach plans.

II. Senior citizen lifetime guaranteed renewable hospital-surgical expense plans.

III. Weekly benefit senior citizen hospital expense plans—group approach and guaranteed renewable for life.

IV. Senior citizen catastrophic expense plans.

V. Additional hospital-surgical expense plans providing continuation of protection regardless of changes in health.

VI. Guaranteed renewable lifetime hospital-surgical expense plans—issued to persons under 65 years of age.

VII. Guaranteed renewable lifetime hospital-surgical expense plans fully paid up at 65.

VIII. Guaranteed renewable major medical plans with lifetime coverage or extended benefits beyond 65.

INTRODUCTION

Today Americans, 65 years of age and over, have available to them a variety of health insurance plans and policies provided by insurance companies which guarantee lifetime protection against health care costs.

These health insurance programs help policyholders meet the expenses of both serious and catastrophic illnesses and injuries. They offer a wide range of benefits which can be selected to meet the individual's budgetary situation and health care requirements.

This report, compiled from material published as of June 1, 1961, contains a broad selection of the many health insurance plans and policies now available which offer protection guaranteed to be renewed for the lifetime of the insured person. This listing, although lengthy, should not be considered all inclusive.

The selected yearly premiums shown in each of the following sections refer to the cost ranges of the plans as listed. Benefits listed within each program show the minimum and maximum amounts available—along with the entrance ages required for application.

It does not take into consideration persons over 65 who are working and protected under employer group health insurance plans nor the growing trend in extending the benefits of such employer plans to retired employees. Rather, it outlines a representation of plans and policies from which noninsured 65 plus people can select their health insurance protection.

For those persons who have not as yet reached the senior citizen years, this report also contains many health insurance plans whose guaranteed protection can be carried into their older age. Some of these plans become fully paid up at 65 with their benefits continuing for life.

On the second, the activity of industry, I should like to make reference to material which I have inserted in the hearings of the Ways and Means Committee on H.R. 4222. This gives a non-exhaustive list of companies which provide some form of assistance in meeting the medical care costs of their retired workers. It also makes a deeper study of the specific provisions of 23 companies, some on the list and others not on it. It shows a growing interest in the

problem and increasing action to meet it on the part of America's private businesses.

Our society is not standing still, ignoring the needs which exist. It is moving to meet them in an effective way.

Soviet Aggression

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, last week I filed a resolution calling for the State Department to alert organized labor and other groups to arouse public opinion on the facts of the Soviet violation of the Quadripartite Agreement of 1949 regarding the freedom of West Germany and West Berlin.

The following is an editorial by H. B. Snyder, publisher and editor of the Gary (Ind.) Post-Tribune on this proposal:

TWO KINDS OF CRITICISM

Representative RAY J. MADDEN probably will have plenty of support for his idea of making next week "criticize Russia week" except that a great many will not want to wait.

What MADDEN asked in the resolution he proposed to the House was that the President set aside the week beginning with Labor Day "as a period for all labor, industry and business, and all civic and fraternal organizations and other groups, to pass resolutions and take other appropriate action condemning the Soviet Communist leaders for violating and abrogating the Quadripartite Agreement of 1949" by closing off East Berlin.

Probably there will be no more active critics of Nikita Khrushchev and his entourage than members of the 395th Evacuation Hospital Unit, the Gary Army Reserve unit called up for active duty, and the increasing number of young men being summoned in the draft.

Their criticism will be two-pronged. There will be, of course, the grouching and griping understandable with any whose normal lives are interrupted because their country needs them, not anger aimed at their own country but at the fate which makes them the instruments of their country's need, and particularly at the international Communist conspiracy which activates their current fate.

But, in addition to their grumbling criticism which is inevitable, these young men and women called into active service will be a part of the criticism which can count—the quiet criticism of military strength in being, the sort of criticism which can be converted into action.

Included in the above groups of critics, also, will be the numerous young men from Gary and the entire area who are already on active duty, many of them in such far places as Korea, Germany and Formosa, whose tours of active duty seem likely to be extended for at least 2 months. Two months may seem a short time when you're sitting at home, but any added time is a long time when one already has begun counting days in the hundreds—until he gets out.

The feeling still is strong that these young people called to duty probably will not be

called to action. If that is true, it probably will be largely true because of the very fact that they have been called to duty. A build-up of military strength is the type of criticism the Kremlin understands most readily.

"Certainly nobody in his right senses wants a shooting war," said the Gary Congressman in supporting his resolution on the floor of the House last week, "but experience with the Communist dictators and Hitler and Mussolini has taught us that failure to act in protest and insist on justice, will ultimately mean the loss of liberty eventually throughout the whole world."

We share MADDEN's view that "sometimes our State Department during recent years has been hesitant in doing anything that might offend Nikita Khrushchev," but we think that now he may be offended where it hurts—by an addition of military strength.

The administration has in these recent days taken some of the painful steps it pledged at the outset by calling on some for the sacrifice it said would be needed. Whether it has called on enough yet remains to be seen.

We hope a great many organizations will follow Representative MADDEN's suggestion of criticizing the Soviet Union's worldwide imperial designs next week.

We hope more firmly that the criticism now being activated by the national administration will be heard in Moscow in the words it means to say—that America doesn't want war, but that America is getting ready because it has no intention of accepting any further Soviet expansion lying down.

Speech of Hon. Wilbur D. Mills, on the 25th Anniversary of Service of Hon. Eugene Keogh in the House of Representatives

SPEECH

OF

HON. WILBUR D. MILLS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in extending birthday greetings to my esteemed friend and distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York, EUGENE KEOGH, and in commemorating his 25th anniversary as a Member of the House of Representatives.

This body is fortunate in having as one of its senior members a man of the stature of GENE KEOGH. He is a bulwark of strength in the Ways and Means Committee. His knowledge of the laws within our jurisdiction is deep, detailed, and precise. I know of no individual who has a more brilliant mind or who is a stronger advocate than GENE KEOGH. He has sponsored, successfully, during his period of service in this body, a great number of legislative measures in the public interest. His district is indeed fortunate in having such representation in the Congress. The Committee on Ways and Means is fortunate to have him as one of its senior members. We in the House are fortunate in having the benefit of his brilliant mind, his professional skill and his powerful advocacy.

I join with all his friends in extending to GENE KEOGH many happy returns

of the day, and I join in the wish previously expressed that we will have the opportunity of commemorating many subsequent such occasions.

Analysis of Operation Employment Recommendations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the newspapers of the Nation are currently engaged in editorial and analytical comment as to the recommendations of the House Republican policy committee report, "Employment in the Dynamic American Economy." This is all to the good, and should be encouraged in the future.

One of the best examples of such comment is an article by Prof. Sidney C. Sufrin, Maxwell School of Citizenship, Syracuse University, which appeared in the recent issue of the Syracuse (N.Y.) Herald-Journal. Professor Sufrin has here analyzed more fully our recommendations on coordination of services between the U.S. Department of Labor and the Office of Education, and on the need for vocational and educational guidance in national manpower policies. His conclusions as to the need for integrated employment services are excellent, and I would like to call them to the attention of my colleagues by inserting his article at this point in the RECORD:

WORK POLICY NEGLECTED—UNITED STATES NEEDS INTEGRATED PROGRAM

(Increasing attention is being directed toward "retraining" those chronically out of a job so that they can move to communities where manpower is needed. Experimental legislation is now before Congress, although it probably will not receive favorable attention at this session. The Republican Policy Committee has finished a 7-month study by 48 GOP Members of the House who presented 20 recommendations for channeling unemployed into job-offering areas, stating that "there is actually a shortage of labor in the United States." Among the 20 recommendations was a call for "greater emphasis on vocational and educational guidance in national manpower policies and in the Armed Forces and better cooperation between the Department of Labor and the U.S. Office of Education." The following article explores that recommendation.)

(By Sidney C. Sufrin)

The first bill of the Kennedy administration presented in the Senate dealt with distressed areas and was enacted into law. It provides help in the form of Federal loans and grants to communities and rural areas suffering from chronic unemployment.

Yet those who supported the program, including the President himself, recognize that this law is not very effective in reducing chronic unemployment in distressed areas.

President Kennedy has requested that Congress consider additional legislation to assist people in communities which have lost their economic foundation to move—with Government help through additional

education, training and funds—to more prosperous areas so that these people can again become self-supporting.

Congress is considering a bill which, in token fashion, would grapple with assisting unemployed people, as families, in distressed areas to fit themselves for gainful employment, rather than stressing the economic rehabilitation of communities.

All things considered, their is small chance that all areas of chronic unemployment are capable of undergoing any appreciable industrial expansion in the foreseeable future. Young people, and to a lesser extent middle-aged people, will have to find jobs away from their homes.

Sometimes this involves migration; at other times, merely long daily treks to other communities. To find and hold a job in another community often requires training and education different from the training and education found at home. School programs and technical training undertakings in a community take on the coloration of the community.

For example, the industrial orientation of education and training programs in such places as Utica and Amsterdam were reflections of the historic business activity of those communities. It was years after the economic complexion of those cities changed that the educational and training institutions began to reflect the full force of the changes.

It is clear that training as a public concern is closely related to the whole question of migration.

This migration is not of small magnitude.

In the 1950's such States as Alabama, Arkansas, Mississippi, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Vermont, and West Virginia had a net out-migration of at least 10 percent of their population.

Delaware, Florida, Maryland, Alaska, and California had a net in-migration of at least 10 percent of their population.

In a State such as New York, which has little net migration, there is a large in-migration which is offset by an equally large outmigration.

In the United States at present, population is on the move. These people take with them the education they received in their old homes.

New York suffers by the poor educational substance of the States which send people here.

What is being done to better fit the population of the United States which is on the move for jobs and living in their new environment? The answer, sadly enough, is precious little.

There is at present no agency of the Federal Government which has a primary responsibility to concern itself with this monumental problem.

The Departments of Health, Education, and Welfare, Labor, Commerce, and Agriculture are all concerned, but their concern is neither coordinated nor is there a basic statute nor even a fragmentary law which is directed to alleviating the lot of industrial migrants.

What is true of agricultural migrant labor is true of the industrial migrant population.

The departments of Washington scarcely are aware of each other's responsibilities at the working level. Criticism, then, should be directed against the lack of an integrated program, which in turn reflects the lack of a general policy concerned with the national aspects of chronic unemployment, migration, and education.

The Federal Government, if it is to be effective in strengthening the economy and assisting people to find jobs, should concern itself with learning about employment opportunities where they are, skills that are needed and take steps to assist unemployed, especially unemployed youngsters in fitting

themselves for these jobs in the appropriate location. And this task will require more than study and statistical analysis.

It is a tall order, but because the problem is difficult it should not be avoided. On the contrary, because the problem is difficult it should be faced with determination and all the resources which the Federal Government can muster.

Traditionally, America has been a land of migration. That tradition persists.

Family migration will be more difficult and complicated than it was in the past. It is one of the great challenges of the 1960's.

Life Without Viruses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Post-Gazette of August 29, 1961:

SALK SEES POSSIBILITY OF LIFE WITHOUT VIRUSES—ONE SHOT MAY BE ABLE TO CONTROL MANY DISEASES, DOCTOR REPORTS IN JOURNAL

(By Albert W. Bloom)

Dr. Jonas E. Salk yesterday held out the prospect of life without viruses.

And Dr. Salk, conqueror of polio at the University of Pittsburgh Virus Research Laboratory, declared that it appears possible to control viral diseases with killed virus vaccines.

One shot may control many diseases.

Also, says Dr. Salk, immunity to a virus disease can, theoretically at least, be given with a single injection if the immunity-stimulating vaccine is potent enough.

AIR'S VIEWS

Salk aired his views in the current issue of "Postgraduate Medicine," official journal of the Interstate Postgraduate Medical Association.

"The exciting possibilities for the future include the addition to the poliomyelitis vaccines of other viruses which may behave in the same manner, to permit the induction of immunity to any diseases at the same time," Dr. Salk declared.

Very little new knowledge is required for this to be possible in the years ahead.

"The more exciting idea," says Salk, "is what life will be like without viruses."

Developing vaccine potent enough to immunize with one dose won't in itself eliminate paralytic polio from this country.

EXTENT OF USE

"The important and crucial factor is the extent of use of the vaccine," said Dr. Salk. He said Detroit's polio epidemic of 1958 depicts a typical story that has recurred throughout the United States in the past several years.

In Detroit, polio broke out among the Negro population but not among the white population.

The reason was clearly a difference in degree of use of vaccine.

The same pattern was observed in Des Moines, Iowa; Providence, R.I.; Little Rock, Ark.; in Chicago, and elsewhere, wherever localized outbreaks of polio occurred.

Salk took a scholarly swipe at those who persist in claiming that killed virus vaccine can't do as complete a job as live virus vaccine.

WHY DOES IT MATTER

"Why does it matter whether a live virus or a killed virus is used? In part," said Salk, "the question is of academic interest in the kind of discussion which goes on in scientific circles and which no one else cares about."

Many scientists have long insisted that killed virus vaccine would bring about complete immunity, that the effect would be transient, and repeated injections would be required.

Said they, in effect, "Only a live virus vaccine can ultimately eradicate poliomyelitis."

Salk shies from the use of the word "eradicate." He prefers some less extreme word conveying the idea "of approximating extinction." To wipe out a disease absolutely is unlikely.

"Preconceptions that only live virus vaccine could wipe out a disease were false," said Salk.

Killed virus polio vaccine has now been shown to offer effective, potent, and long-lasting immunity—if it is used.

Call for Private Power Probe Shocks Lawmakers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, an article in the Durango Cortez Herald, of Durango, Colo., August 27, said charges made by Democratic National Chairman John Bailey that the private power companies should be investigated hit the upper Colorado Basin delegates like a thunderclap this weekend. I would like to say it also hit other Members of Congress like a thunderclap. I personally was appalled that a person in such high position as Mr. Bailey should have the audacity to suggest that any private citizen or group of citizens should be investigated for exercising their constitutional right of communicating with their elected representatives concerning matters which vitally affect their future welfare.

The Durango Cortez article further said the distinguished chairman of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, Mr. ASPINALL, was coldly furious about the unfortunate tirade made by Mr. Bailey. I would like to compliment my very good friend from Colorado—with whom I have had the privilege of serving on the Interior Committee for many years—for his righteous indignation about these threats and attempts at intimidation.

Because of the seriousness of this situation and the thorough manner in which the reporter for the Durango Cortez reported it, I am inserting the article in the RECORD at this point with the sincere wish that every Member of this House read it with extreme care:

CALL FOR PRIVATE POWER PROBE SHOCKS LAWMAKERS

WASHINGTON.—Charges by Democratic National Chairman John M. Bailey that the private power companies should be investigated in the red-hot Upper Colorado power

dispute hit the Upper Colorado Basin delegation like a thunderclap this weekend.

Bailey charged in the August 28 issue of the Democrat, the party publication, that "private power barons are spending in excess of \$20 million to grab control of a billion-dollar taxpayer investment," the Upper Colorado storage project.

"The power companies' goal is obvious. They want to be the middleman and profiteer between Federal power generating facilities and nonprofit distributors. Power companies are fighting for a license to bleed the consumers of \$3 to \$5 million annual extra rate payments.

"We think it's about time the Congress and the Federal Power Commission investigated these operations," Bailey said.

"The question of how much electricity users should be charged to pay for high-priced public relations men whose main aim is to boost the cost of power begs an answer," Bailey stated.

He claimed that the private power lobby had thrown lush parties at an Arizona country club, and cocktail parties and dinners in Colorado to build up support for their offer to construct some of the Upper Colorado transmission lines. He also claimed that an Arizona power company vice president had been detailed "to spend the year lobbying in Washington."

Bailey's charges followed an investigation made by the staff of the Senate antitrust subcommittee of the activities of the coal lobby here following the recent public versus private power battle over Federal construction of generating facilities in the Hanford, Wash. reactor. The coal interests here are burned up over the investigation. Both the Bailey charges and the subcommittee probe were privately interpreted on Capitol Hill and elsewhere as an attempt to intimidate the coal lobby to withdraw its opposition to Hanford and the private power lobby to withdraw its opposition to Hanford and the all-Federal Upper Colorado transmission system. And some predicted the moves would backfire.

Checks made with Interior Secretary Stewart L. Udall, Chairman Wayne N. Aspinall, Democrat, of Colorado, of the House Interior Committee, the office of Senator Clinton P. Anderson, Democrat, of New Mexico, Senators Gordon Allott, Republican, of Colorado, and John A. Carroll, Democrat, of Colorado, and with H. F. McPhail, of Salt Lake City, executive director of the Colorado River Basin Consumers Power, Inc., indicated that none was aware of the Bailey statement prior to the press release.

ASPINALL was coldly furious about it.

ASPINALL said, "Both sides—the power companies and the preference users—have lobbied in the transmission line controversy. But their activities have been open and aboveboard and I have seen no evidence of unfair tactics," ASPINALL stated.

He said that the Bailey statement was "an example of very poor liaison between Congress and the Democratic National Committee." ASPINALL added that Bailey might have called him, as sponsor of the original storage project, before issuing the blast.

ANDERSON left Washington Friday to have a gall bladder operation at Bataan Memorial Hospital in Albuquerque early this week. His office staff said that the Bailey statement was news to them. Earlier, ANDERSON had told the press that the private utilities had warned the coal industry to oppose Hanford on pain of losing their utility customers.

Udall and McPhail declined to make any public statement about the Bailey charges.

Senator JOHN A. CARROLL, Democrat, of Colorado, who is a member of the Senate Antitrust Subcommittee, said that he was unaware not only of the Bailey charges but also of the subcommittee staff investigation

of the coal lobby. CARROLL said that he had not been contacted much by either side in the upper Colorado controversy, perhaps, he said, because his position is well known as a public power man.

ALLOTT called the Bailey statement "a dreadful shame, from the standpoint of western resource development." ALLOTT said that the rural cooperatives favoring the all-Federal upper Colorado transmission lines had "outlobbied the power companies 25-1" so far as he was concerned. He said that he had received calls from about 50 preference users and that he had only received two calls from private power representatives. He said that the activities of both sides were aboveboard, as far as he knew. "No one has asked me to dinner, even to lunch," ALLOTT stated.

W. L. Reilly, vice president of Arizona Public Service Co., could not be reached for comment about the Bailey charges. Reilly is the captain of the team of the five Colorado River State utilities which seek to build the backbone transmission lines in the upper Colorado project. But after the coal lobby was investigated here by Senate investigators, the private power men were braced for a similar grilling.

Springfield, Ill.—The Land of Lincoln

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER F. MACK, JR.

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. MACK. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to sponsor the U.S. Travel Service Act which was enacted during this session of Congress. Through this act the sponsors envisioned an extensive program to attract tourists into the United States. If this act is to be successful we must have the cooperation and assistance of our States and cities. We need to attract tourists from other countries to visit the United States.

One of the special attractions is the Land of Lincoln at Springfield, Ill. In my travels throughout the world I found that the name of Lincoln was known in nearly every corner of this earth. I feel certain that these Lincoln shrines will attract many foreign visitors. I have today received a very interesting article on this subject written by my friends, Clyde C. Walton, the Illinois State historian, and published in the Ozark Air Lines News. For the benefit of my colleagues I would like to include this article as part of my remarks:

"VISIT U.S.A."—THE LAND OF LINCOLN, SPRINGFIELD, ILL.

Highest point in the central Illinois plain is a silver dome by day and a red beacon by night—the State capitol in Springfield. To Ozark passengers visiting the city it means the Land of Lincoln—fascinating history from a century and more ago.

On arriving at Capital Airport the visitor is 4 miles from downtown Springfield, where there are three major hotels and numerous lesser ones, plus two new motor hotels (there are more than a dozen large motels on the edges of the city). All of them are within walking distance of most of the Lincoln sites—although an automobile tour would be quicker and much less wearing.

First on the history sightseer's list is the Lincoln Home, at Eighth and Jackson Streets, the only home the Emancipator ever owned and where he lived from 1844 until 1861, when he went to Washington. This two-story frame dwelling is completely furnished with pre-Civil War pieces, many of which belonged to the Lincoln family.

Six blocks west of the Lincoln Home is the Centennial Building (Second and Jackson Streets), one of six buildings in the capitol group. Located on the site of the Ninian W. Edwards home, where Abraham Lincoln and Mary Todd were married in November 1842, the Centennial Building houses several agencies of interest to the tourist. On the first floor you can buy your Illinois automobile license; and on the third and fifth floors, respectively, are the Illinois State Historical Library and the Illinois State Museum. In the historical library you can see scores of original letters in Lincoln's handwriting—some of the 1,200 Lincoln documents in the library's collection. There also are Lincoln paintings and sculpture, photographs, miniatures, and many articles that belonged to Lincoln—his shaving mirror, white kid gloves, gold-headed cane, for example, as well as the desk on which he wrote his first inaugural address and a charming walnut handcrafted bookcase from the Lincoln-Herndon law office.

In addition to its Lincoln manuscripts, the library has more than half a million other original documents and 100,000 books relating to the history of Illinois and her leaders. These books and documents may be used on request.

The Illinois State Museum is, like the historical library, a many-purpose agency—used by scholars as well as casual visitors. Its exhibits include outstanding natural history habitat groups, an art gallery, displays of Indian costumes and artifacts, as well as special exhibits that change from time to time, varying from collections of oriental lacquer work to medieval armor.

Visitors are also welcome in the Illinois Archives Building, the handsomely refurbished State capitol, the supreme court building, the State armory, and the new State office building.

Three blocks east of the capitol group, in the heart of downtown Springfield, is the historic Sangamon County Courthouse, a simple sandstone building of Doric design, which served as the Illinois State capitol from 1840 to 1876. There, in the old chamber of the house of representatives, Abraham Lincoln delivered his famous "House Divided" speech in 1858. And there, 3 years later, Stephen A. Douglas made his impassioned plea for preservation of the Union.

Three blocks from the old Statehouse is the First Presbyterian Church, at Capitol and Seventh, where visitors can see the pew rented by the Lincoln family.

But the most impressive of all the Lincoln shrines in Springfield is the Lincoln Tomb in Oak Ridge Cemetery, about a mile north of the courthouse square. The beautiful monument which marks the burial place of Abraham Lincoln and his wife and three of their four sons is a towering obelisk of granite, dedicated in 1874. Inside the plain square base of the monument are the Lincoln crypts, which are reached by corridors, lined with Lincoln statuary. Engraved in the wall above the Lincoln cenotaph are the words of Lincoln's Secretary of War, Edwin M. Stanton: "Now he belongs to the ages."

A very different kind of memorial to Illinois' great Civil War President is the 60-acre Memorial Gardens—composed of native wild flowers and trees. These gardens, created by the Garden Club of Illinois, are located on the eastern shore of Lake Springfield, a few miles southeast of the city.

This 4,000-acre lake, completed in 1933, is symbolic of modern Metropolitan Spring-

field. Surrounded by fine homes and public recreation areas (which include a golf course and beaches), the lake provides a source of pure water for domestic and industrial use for Springfield and a number of smaller communities within a radius of 15 miles. Near the steel and concrete dam which impounds the lake is a coal-burning electric power generating plant. The combination of ample water supplies and low municipal power rates has attracted many diversified industries into this rich farming area.

Eighteen miles northwest of modern Springfield, the visitor finds himself in another world—the sleepy Sangamon River village of New Salem, reconstructed as it looked in the 1830's when Abraham Lincoln lived there. One of the original log cabins in the village, the Onstott Cooper Shop, is still there, and the other buildings—13 homes, a tavern, a school, a saw and grist mill, and several stores and shops—have been reproduced and furnished in authentic style.

The village is one of Illinois' State parks, and the State division of parks has provided picnic and camping grounds in the park area. Several modern motels and inns are also located nearby. Transportation from Springfield to the park can be easily arranged.

Returning to Springfield from New Salem on the Lincoln Memorial Highway, the 20th century visitor can follow the same trail that Abraham Lincoln walked more than a century and a quarter ago.

Secession and Fort Sumter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the following address by the Honorable James F. Byrnes is not only a magnificent oration, but is a remarkably accurate, historical document worthy of preservation for all time to come:

ADDRESS OF HON. JAMES F. BYRNES AT THE
CHARLESTON CONFEDERATE CENTENNIAL,
APRIL 11, 1961

The Senate Judiciary Committee in reporting the resolution establishing the Centennial Commission stated its purpose was to encourage public knowledge of the history of the social, economic, and other causes of the Civil War and its results.

There can be no doubt of the good intentions of the sponsors of the Resolution but in my humble opinion it was a mistake. Winston Churchill, in his "History of the English Speaking Peoples" wrote: "The cleavages of the great Civil War (of England) dominated English life for two centuries, and many strange examples of their persistency survive under universal suffrage in English Constituencies today."

Our Civil War was the greatest tragedy in the history of any country. After two centuries its battles might be commemorated but one century is a short period in the history of a country and I fear it is quite impossible to relive the 4 years of the Civil War without recalling experiences that will be unpleasant to the people of both the North and South.

However, I am confident no man is more anxious, and if let alone, is more able to administer the resolution than Gen. U. S. Grant III.

Southerners frequently make history but seldom write it. Many sincere northerners from their reading of history, have an impressive entirely different from the accepted view in the South as to the causes of the war. In the next 4 years many speeches made by northerners on this subject will displease you. My views on the subject and particularly as to the bombardment of Fort Sumter may displease others, but I must state my view, which is based in great part upon the official records.

For the views of southern leaders in 1860 as to the right of a State to secede, there was justification. The Declaration of Independence had referred to "free and independent States" and the fundamental opposition of the people to Government "without consent of the governed."

The 56 signers of that instrument, in referring to the compact between the United States of America spelled the adjective "united" with a little "u." The Continental Congress drafted the Articles of Confederation which declared that "each State retains its sovereignty, freedom, and independence," and every power which is not delegated to the United States.

In the treaty ending the Revolutionary War, Great Britain referred to each one of the States separately, acknowledging them to be free sovereign and independent States.

At the Constitutional Convention, Madison declared that "the use of force against a State would look more like a declaration of war than the infliction of punishment." And the great Federalist, Alexander Hamilton, said that "to coerce the States is one of the maddest projects ever devised."

This desire of the people of all States to limit the power of the Federal Government was so well understood that the men who drafted the Constitution thought it unnecessary to declare it. However, when the instrument was submitted for ratification, it appeared certain to be rejected by the States until pledges were received from its advocates that the Constitution would be promptly amended. This was done in the Bill of Rights, the 10th amendment declaring, "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution or prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively or to the people."

That is in the Constitution today and no political party would dare advocate its repeal. Instead, through the years the proponents of a centralized government have advocated legislation in violation of the 10th amendment and have relied upon such violations being approved by the Supreme Court.

In the half century following the ratification of the Constitution cheap labor from abroad enabled the northern States to make great progress industrially while the South, relying almost entirely upon agriculture, made less progress. The industrial North demanded tariff laws to protect its industries. The South opposed a protective tariff law because it meant increased prices for what they had to buy.

The economic conflict that divided the sections was mild compared to that arising out of slavery. The African slaves were brought to this country first by slave traders of Spain; then by British traders and later by the slave traders of New England. When the Constitution was adopted slavery existed in 12 of the 13 States. The industrial northern States soon found it impractical to use slaves in manufacturing plants and gradually sold them to the agricultural South. When they had disposed of their slaves, the North began efforts to abolish slavery in all States.

There can be no doubt that the cold war of 100 years ago was started by many who sincerely opposed the institution of slavery.

It was opposed by many leaders in the South. It is my belief that in 1860 slavery was on the way out, and had there been no war, ways and means would have been found to abolish it.

From my own study in boyhood days, I could not understand how the people of all the States had ever favored slavery. God never made a man wise enough or good enough to own a human being. New England brought them here, but the South bought them. For our sin we are still being punished. It is our cross and it prevents us from giving to many subjects the unbiased consideration of which we are capable.

The economic problems, plus the agitation of the slavery problem, aroused the passions of the people. Whenever that happens, people do not think or act wisely. The political leaders found it impossible to devise a satisfactory compromise between the National and State Governments.

In 1857 the Supreme Court in the Dred Scott case held that within the meaning of the Constitution, a Negro was not a citizen and could not sue in the U.S. courts. The decision aroused the nonslave States. On June 26, 1857, Abraham Lincoln attacked the Court and argued the decision was not binding as a precedent. The Supreme Court was widely denounced in the North, but no editor there attacked the critics of the Court nor argued that the decision was the law of the land.

In Boston, following the decision, there were rumors of secession and efforts were made to hold a secession convention at Worcester, Mass. That doctrine did not originate in the South.

As early as January 1804, Senator Timothy Pickens, in a letter to George Cabot, said: "I do not believe in the practicability of a long-continued union. A northern confederacy would unite congenial characters and present a fairer prospect of public happiness; while the Southern States, having a similarity of habits, might be left to manage their own affairs in their own way. If a separation were to take place, our mutual wants would render a friendly and commercial intercourse inevitable."

During the War of 1812 there was held at Hartford, Conn., a secession convention with delegates from five New England States. They demanded seven changes in the Constitution and complained of many violations of the rights of the States. A committee was appointed to present their demands to the Congress and report back in 6 months, but when shortly thereafter the war ended with a satisfactory treaty with Great Britain, the subject was dropped.

The people of the Original Thirteen States did not doubt their right to withdraw from the compact whenever they believed it in their interest. They knew the National Government had been created by the States and thought the creature could not be greater than the creators.

It was with full knowledge of these historical precedents that, when the cold war, diligently conducted by the political extremists of the North, could no longer be tolerated, South Carolinians met first at Columbia and then in Charleston in December 1860, and finally with great reluctance, adopted the resolution of secession. Other Southern States followed.

In February 1861, the Congress of the Confederate States of America met in Montgomery and Jefferson Davis was inaugurated President. In his inaugural address, President Davis did not once mention slavery. He did defend the Constitution and the right of States to withdraw from the compact between the States. His address was really a prayer for the preservation of peace.

When Lincoln was inaugurated, Davis, still hoping to avoid war, dispatched three commissioners to Washington to request through

the Secretary of State an audience with the President to convey to him the sincere desire of the newly created government of the Confederate States, to bring about a peaceful settlement.

On March 15, they sent such a written request to Secretary of State Seward. With the approval of President Lincoln, Seward took the position that he was entrusted only with the control of foreign affairs, subject to the approval of the President, and he could not see the commissioners or grant their request to arrange a conference with the President because it might be construed as recognition of the Confederate States of America. That was a mistake. A conference might have averted a war.

Seven of the Original Thirteen States then composed the Confederate Government. If Lincoln chose to take the position that the 5 million people of those States had not seceded, they were still citizens of the United States and he could have received their representatives. If he could not receive them publicly, he should not have dealt with them secretly through intermediaries, as he did.

The Secretary of State asked Justice Nelson, a New Yorker, and a member of the Supreme Court, to request Justice Campbell, of Alabama, to act as a mediator.

Campbell, accompanied by Nelson, called on Seward who said that a civil war might be prevented by the mediation of Campbell. Seward authorized Campbell to advise Davis that "before this letter reaches you, Sumter will have been evacuated."

Justice Campbell wrote to Judge Crawford, one of Davis' commissioners, that Fort Sumter would be evacuated "within the next 5 days." The 5 days elapsed. Campbell and Nelson again called upon Seward with a telegram from General Beauregard stating Fort Sumter was not evacuated. Seward assured them the failure was not due to bad faith but to causes necessary to carry out the intention to evacuate.

In the meantime a Captain Fox, professing a peaceful mission, was allowed to visit Fort Sumter. Then a Colonel Lamont, a Springfield friend of President Lincoln, visited Charleston and told Governor Pickens he came to arrange for the removal of the garrison. Lamont did advise Lincoln that Major Anderson favored evacuation.

Because of many rumors, Campbell again communicated with Seward and on April 1 received from him a written statement, "I am satisfied the government will not undertake to supply Fort Sumter without giving notice to Governor P." But Lincoln ordered the expedition to start for Charleston by April 6. That order was equivalent to a declaration of war.

On April 7 Justice Campbell again addressed Secretary Seward, stating that the government had alarmed the South by its reported preparations of a fleet to reinforce Sumter. Seward's reply was the cryptic "Faith as to Sumter fully kept—wait and see." On that day the Charleston Courier announced that en route to Charleston Harbor was a formidable armada. According to the Federal Government's own statement, this armada consisted of "8 vessels carrying 26 guns and about 1,400 men."

The day before Seward gave Campbell the assurance that "Faith as to Sumter would be kept" written instructions dated April 6, had been given to Robert Chew of the State Department, to be read to Governor Pickens and General Beauregard: "I am directed by the President of the United States to notify you to expect an attempt will be made to supply Fort Sumter with provisions only, and that if such an attempt be not resisted, no effort to throw in men, arms, or ammunition will be made without further notice or in case of an attack upon the fort."

From the record, it is evident the arrival of the expedition was expected shortly after

the delivery of Lincoln's message, at a late hour on the 8th. That would have given Beauregard no opportunity to get instructions from the Confederate Government.

Complete deception was thwarted by a severe storm off Cape Hatteras which delayed the Federal ships. And, because President Davis had received confidential information from many sources of the sailing of the fleet, he had advised Beauregard to be on the alert for a conflict and the Confederate forces stood in readiness.

From official records, it is clear Lincoln had conflicting advice. He requested the advice of Gen. Winfield Scott, who advised it would be a tragedy to attempt to reinforce Sumter. Scott prepared an order for the President's signature providing for the evacuation of the fort. Lincoln decided to disregard the advice of his military advisers. He sent to Charleston Capt. Gustavus Fox, a textile agent of Massachusetts, who formerly had been a naval officer, to decide whether Sumter could be successfully reinforced. Fox, on the false pledge that he came on a peaceful mission, was on March 21, permitted by order of Governor Pickens to visit Fort Sumter. He did not tell Anderson his purpose, but later reported to the President that Sumter could be reinforced. At his request, Lincoln sent him to New York to secretly prepare the expedition and placed him in command of it.

Lincoln was not the first nor the last President to do harm because of the advice of an unofficial but ambitious do-gooder.

These were crowded days. On April 11, the President of the Confederacy instructed Beauregard to demand evacuation of Fort Sumter and if the demand was refused, to reduce it. That afternoon under a flag of truce, the ultimatum was conveyed to Major Anderson. Because of the recent instructions from his Government, Anderson decided he could not comply and sadly remarked "I will await the first shot" and then added "if you do not batter us to pieces, we will be starved out in a few days."

President Davis understood the terrible situation confronting his old friend, Major Anderson and he saw through Lincoln's efforts to goad the South into shooting. Anderson's reply quickly became known and aroused great excitement in Charleston. People lined the waterfront looking toward the sea. Notwithstanding the demands for immediate action President Davis, with patience and his love of peace, made one more effort by having his Secretary of War wire General Beauregard a message, pursuant to which Beauregard, at 11 p.m., wrote Major Anderson, "We do not desire needlessly to bombard Fort Sumter. If you will state the time at which you will evacuate Fort Sumter, we will abstain from opening fire upon you."

When the message was presented by Colonel Chestnut, Major Anderson at midnight held a conference with his top officials. He had a fateful decision to make: If to avoid a war he agreed to evacuate, he knew he would be branded a traitor. The alternative was that his men would face death. Finally Anderson answered, in writing, that he would evacuate by noon of the 15th provided he did not receive prior to that time controlling instructions from his government or additional supplies.

The proviso imposed made acceptance impossible because Chestnut knew that at that very moment some of the ships were at the entrance of the harbor. Colonel Chestnut asked for paper and pen and addressed to Anderson one sentence, notifying him that they would open fire on Fort Sumter 1 hour from that time. It was then 3:20 and at 4:30 the first shot was fired from Fort Johnson.

That afternoon Beauregard wired President Davis that he would take possession of

Fort Sumter the following morning and allow Major Anderson the privilege of saluting his flag. Davis was happy when he learned no one had been killed in taking the fort.

Most historians have overlooked the treatment accorded Major Anderson. He was kept entirely in the dark. Captain Fox, a civilian friend of President Lincoln, sought information of him but gave none.

Lamont led Anderson to believe the idea of relief had been abandoned. Not until April 7 did Anderson receive any word from his government. Then he was advised by Secretary of War Cameron that the expedition was on the way and he should hold out if possible until the ships arrived.

The following day Major Anderson wrote the Adjutant General, Col. Lorenz Thomas, a significant and courageous letter, from which I quote:

"I had the honor to receive by yesterday's mail, the letter of the honorable Secretary of War, dated April 4, and confess that what he there states surprises me very greatly. I trust that this matter will be at once put in a correct light, as a movement made now, when the South has been erroneously informed that none such would be attempted, would produce most disastrous results throughout our country.

"It is, of course, now too late for me to give any advice in reference to the proposed scheme of Captain Fox. I fear that its result cannot fail to be disastrous to all concerned. Even with his boat at our walls, the loss of life (as I think I mentioned to Mr. Fox) in unloading her, will more than pay for the good to be accomplished by the expedition.

"We have not oil enough to keep a light in the lantern for one night. The boats will have to, therefore, rely at night entirely upon other marks. I ought to have been informed that this expedition was to come. Colonel Lamont's remark convinced me that the idea, merely hinted at to me by Captain Fox, would not be carried out.

"We shall strive to do our duty, though I frankly say that my heart is not in this war, which I see is to be thus commenced. That God will still avert it, and cause us to resort to pacific means to maintain our rights, is my ardent prayer." (Official Records, series I, vol. 1, p. 294.)

Because of the general knowledge that the military expedition was then on its way, this letter was intercepted and it appears in the official records of the Confederacy.

It is significant because this loyal Federal officer described the expedition as a "scheme of Captain Fox"; and significant, too, is the reference to "the war to be thus commenced". It was thus commenced.

President Lincoln must have known of the solemn promises made by Seward to Justices Campbell and Nelson that Fort Sumter would be evacuated, and it is certain that Seward knew at the time he made these pledges, that Lincoln had ordered the outfitting of the expedition and that the fleet was then on its way.

Lincoln had deliberately goaded the Confederate government into firing upon the fort and when the scheme was discovered, the people of the South were enraged.

The attitude of the responsible officials of the Confederate government at that time was accurately expressed by President Davis in his address to the Confederate congress: "We protest solemnly in the face of mankind that we desire peace at any sacrifice, save that of honor. We seek no conquest, no aggrandizement, no concession of any kind from the States from which we have lately been confederated. All we ask is to be let alone and that those who never held power over us should not attempt our subjugation by arms."

Had their hope for peace been based on power, there was little justification for it.

The Northern States had three times the population; four times the bank deposits and five times the number of factories of the South. In the face of such odds, hope had to be based on principle supported by courage of a free people willing to sacrifice their fortunes and their lives.

Four years later, at Appomattox, Lee surrendered and with his surrender the issue of secession was forever settled. But I cannot refrain from saying, it was settled by might and not by right, under our Constitution.

The centennial resolution refers to results of this war, but with the tensions existing throughout the world today, I would not discuss events of the resulting reconstruction era. However, in mitigation of what was done by the army of occupation, I express the belief that most of the oppressive acts from which we suffered were committed not by the fighting men of the Union Army as it existed prior to the surrender.

We can recall how, after both World Wars, men in the armed services maneuvered to secure discharge. I am sure the Union soldiers, after 4 years of war, similarly exerted every influence to be permitted to return to their homes and businesses. They were replaced by other men, many of whom had no homes and no businesses, and who saw an opportunity to prey upon a conquered people. When southern leaders protested against the crimes of reconstruction, many northerners thought it was only the cry of poor losers. Gradually, however, the truth was realized in the North, and many retired Union soldiers assisted the courageous southerners to bring an end to the tragic era.

During that nightmare which lasted 10 years, the governments of the Southern States were in the hands of adventurers from the North, called carpetbaggers, plus southern traitors, called scalawags. Of course, their control was possible only because of the votes of the recently freed African slaves, and the support of the army of occupation.

The white men and women who lived through that period seldom blamed the Negroes. They knew that the white man had behind him centuries of training and self-control, and they should not apply the same yardstick to the recently freed slaves who had no such background and no educational opportunities.

With the return of governments to the control of the white people, cordial relations were soon established between the white people and the Negroes. Negro men worked by the side of white men; Negro women worked in the homes of white women. Without a Marshall plan or aid of any kind from the Federal Government, they brought the South from poverty to prosperity.

In the years that have passed, the Negro has made greater progress in the South than in any other place on earth. One has but to read of the Negroes in Africa today to realize the fabulous progress of the southern Negroes. They are being educated and, certainly in this State, their schools are as good and in many instances, are superior to the schools for white children. They have gone into the professions and into business. Thousands own their farms and their homes. I am proud of their progress.

Even more incredible to the foreigner is the fine relationship existing between the people of the South and the North. Our people have shown a surprising capacity for forgiveness, even if they do not forget.

Our willingness and ability to unite was proved soon after reconstruction, in the Spanish-American War. In World War I the loyalty of the South was again demonstrated. When the first draft law was enacted the county of Union, in this State, furnished so many volunteers that not a single man was drafted. In World War II

and in the Korean war the heroism of the sons of the South was too dramatic for me to attempt to recite.

In the field of domestic affairs our people will differ and fight for what they believe to be right, but all the world should realize that when danger threatens from abroad, our differences will be forgotten and all Americans will unite to defend the land we love.

Wheat's the Thing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. J. FLOYD BREEDING

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of this distinguished body a reprint of an article from the Great Bend Tribune, appearing in the Hutchinson News of August 28, entitled "Wheat's the Thing," which I thought my colleagues would enjoy reading, in connection with the storage of wheat in urban areas:

WHEAT'S THE THING

Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman has proposed that some of the Nation's wheat surplus be stored near metropolitan areas, for emergency use in the event of nuclear war.

The suggestion brought catcalls from Kansas' Republican legislators. They say the shipment and storage involved would be a waste of money, and they question whether the public would know what to do with the wheat if they had it.

As we analyze it, the public's ignorance in the field of raw wheat would in this case be bliss. It would actually be the saving feature of the program. Secretary Freeman apparently hasn't contemplated putting a sack of wheat in every household, hence the GOP groans about storage expense. Here Mr. Freeman has failed to go the whole mile. There is no reason why the wheat couldn't be delivered right to the housewife, for storage in her basement, or in some seldom-used closet.

The arrangement would work for the very reason that Mrs. John Q. Public wouldn't know what to do with her sack of wheat except to store it.

Mr. Freeman's idea, ostensibly is to provide emergency food stores for use in the event that the Nation's normal distribution system is paralyzed. It would seem then that delivery now to the family doorstep would best serve the ultimate goal. If placed in the hands of the ultimate users, the wheat won't be locked in some towering concrete bin while the residents of Gotham or Philadelphia cower in their basements. The wheat should be right beside them, where they can eat it.

And this is why wheat is such a natural. If the Government sought to store canned goods in Mrs. J. Q. Public's basement, Mrs. Public would snitch. She'd slip down from time to time—on those occasions when the stores are closed and she has run short of greenbeans—and borrow from the emergency larder. Long before the war, she would have cut her supplies down to a few cans of okra and sauerkraut.

Trying to stay alive on what she hadn't already worked into the family meals would hardly be worth it.

But what wouldn't tempt her. Her grandmother, maybe, but not the modern-day housewife. She isn't even very friendly with

flour. Brown-and-serve rolls and add-milk cake mix are her forte. Her emergency wheat supply would be just that, a source of protein in dire emergency. She wouldn't any more borrow a cup under peaceful circumstances than she'd bake one of her daughter's mud pies in the oven. When the last stale bread crumb and frozen TV dinner were gone, and after the pangs of hunger were fairly pronounced, then this sack of little brown berries would take on meaning.

Frankly, we had thought Secretary Freeman was nuts too. Popcorn, we mused, would be so much more useful as an emergency food item. The housewife still knows the rudiments of popping. She could keep the family alive for days on the easily stored, easily prepared grain.

It was then that we could see the Freeman wisdom. If the Government gave the public popcorn, it would be gone long before the battle. Wheat's the thing.

Talk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, there is considerable talk these days about having negotiations with Russia on the Berlin problem.

To negotiate means to evaluate the elements of a problem toward the end of effecting a solution, with compromise being an ingredient vital to the total process.

Inasmuch as Russia has historically proved to be without reason in instances where the United States has attempted to solve problems existing between these two nations, one wonders just what miraculous formula our officials have conceived to permit them to reason with unreasonable people.

Talk can be cheap, particularly when it does not succeed in accomplishing a constructive purpose. In this respect, I insert into the RECORD an appropriate article from the editorial section of the August 31 issue of the Wall Street Journal:

TALK

But what are they going to talk about?

This isn't a facetious question. For plainly there are going to be talks between the West and the Soviets over Berlin; Secretary of State Rusk says they may take place before the opening of the U.N. General Assembly in September, but in any event sometime during the fall. And equally plainly, if men are going to negotiate on any issue they have to know what there is to negotiate.

West German Foreign Minister Von Brentano, says that the talks are urgently needed to "make clear" the positions of both sides, East and West. At best, this is an incomplete statement of the task. The Russian position is certainly clear enough: West Berlin is a bone in Mr. Khrushchev's throat, and he wants to pluck it out. The Western position is that we will not surrender in that place to another aggression by the Communist empire—or, at least, that is the West's position if the words of its statesmen mean anything.

The British equally skirt the issue, or so it seems to us, when they say the purpose

of the talks is to avoid a war over Berlin. The avoidance of war is indeed a prime task of statesmen, but if the avoidance of war were their only task then it would be simple. War can always be avoided by yielding to an aggressor; if Hitler had been yielded to at every point there would have been no World War II. There will certainly be no war over Berlin if Mr. Khrushchev "negotiates" the whole of it.

So we come back, then, to the deadly serious question: What is it that, in these talks, we intend to negotiate?

Mr. Khrushchev says he is going to sign a treaty with the East Germans and that this will give their puppet government jurisdiction over all the access routes to West Berlin. Perhaps, as some people have argued, the East German Government would then be willing to sign an agreement with the West reaffirming our routes of entry. Are we prepared to accept this "quid" when the "quo" would be the acceptance of the East German Government as a separate, sovereign entity—and therefore the recognition of a permanently divided Germany?

There has been much talk about making West Berlin a "free city." This was proposed by Mr. Khrushchev and seconded, though in different words, by some Members of our Congress. Is this an acceptable proposal to men who remember Danzig? And if it is to be talked about, does it mean that the West withdraws its troops from West Berlin while the Communists keep their tanks in East Berlin just across the Brandenburg Gate?

In this phrase "free city" there is a yawning trap of words unless we know precisely what we are talking about, and what the Communists are talking about. Its allure is in the promise that it will preserve all those rights of the West Berliners for access to West Germany. Its share is that making it a denationalized city would cut it off from West Germany. Its snare is that making it a the communism which surrounds it.

All these "points of negotiation" have one thing in common. They would make the city of West Berlin, which is now free in the true sense of the word, less free than it was before. Therefore the Communists stand to gain from any negotiated changes in the forms and technicalities. And the Communists know it—whether we do or not.

For negotiation to have any real meaning it would have to embrace also changes in the encircling communism in East Berlin and East Germany. But this is what, so far, the West is not agreed to insist upon. And it is, of course, precisely what the Soviets refuse to negotiate.

The truth is that we have a Berlin crisis today only because the Communists want to swallow the prey. Until that changes, every time the statesmen of the West sit down to talk with the men from the Kremlin the question will abide: What are they going to talk about?

Poor Return to the American Taxpayers for Their \$8.2 Billion Given to Neutrals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Washington Daily News reminds us of the return the American people are getting from the

so-called neutral nations for our freely given dollars. The leaders meeting in Belgrade see nothing morally wrong in accepting \$8.2 billion from the American people to keep their nations secure and at the same time line up on the side of the Communists on every issue Khrushchev stirs up to bring about our destruction. Mr. Speaker, I hope the Members may reconsider our foreign aid program when the appropriation bill comes up next week and eliminate every cent for countries who have consistently aided our enemies, or who deny their own people the basic freedoms. Let us put an end to the foolhardy course we have been following of spending billions for defense against communism and billions to build up and maintain nations who are allied in philosophy and almost in practice with the Soviet Union.

OUR NEUTRAL FRIENDS

"Why should that man speak ill of me?" once asked Pennsylvania Political Boss Botes Penrose. "I've never done a favor for him."

Meeting in Belgrade this week are the representatives of 24 nations or political entities that could, if they would, count favors from the United States to the total of \$8.2 billion.

That is the amount of money we have given, or are committed to give them, in various forms of aid—military, economic, food, loans, grants.

It is advertised as a meeting of neutrals. It will be interesting to observe—from their deliberations and resolutions and future votes in the United Nations—whom they are neutral against.

Let's call the roll, alphabetically, and list the U.S. dollars:

Afghanistan, \$146 million; Algerian FLN, none; Burma, \$93 million; Cambodia, \$263 million; Ceylon, \$65 million; Cuba, \$41 million (pre-Castro); Cyprus, none; Ethiopia, \$114 million; Ghana, \$4 million; Guinea, \$4 million; India, \$3,800 million; Indonesia, \$560 million; Iraq, \$46 million; Lebanon, \$86 million; Mali, none; Morocco, \$194 million; Nepal, \$40 million; Saudi Arabia, \$46 million; Somali, \$9 million; Sudan, \$44 million; Tunisia, \$135 million; United Arab Republic, \$295 million; Yemen, \$11 million, and Yugoslavia, \$2,200 million.

Some of these countries have also received substantial Russian aid.

The largest voices at the Belgrade powwow, as the figures indicate, will be India's Nehru, Yugoslavia's Tito, UAR's Nasser and Indonesia's Sukarno. They will all be vocal for peace, in sincere idealism, and also perhaps as a matter of self-interest. For if big-power shooting should start, the foreign aid spigot would be shut off tight while we used all our resources for our own survival, and some neutrals would not even be able to feed themselves.

And as self-appointed umpires of the cold war, they'll have ideas on how to settle the Berlin crisis—ideas easier to come by since none has a single soldier guarding the freedom of Berlin.

But will they applaud Britain, France and the United States for trying to keep the peace? Will they condemn the U.S.S.R. and puppet East Germany for erecting concrete and barbed-wire barricades across Berlin and creating the crisis? On the basis of past performance, that is not likely. For the neutrals have learned they may criticize the free world and be heeded, whereas the Communist dictatorships pay no attention whatever to criticisms.

Neutrality has its obvious advantages to all of the nations represented at Belgrade, and we could wish some were more neutral

than they are. But it would be heartening if there were an occasional sign of recognition that their neutrality is possible only because there are free world powers to give them protection.

Dominy Shows His True Colors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, recently a good friend from Boise, Idaho, sent me a very interesting byline column which appeared on Sunday, August 20, in the Idaho Statesman, and an editorial which appeared in the same newspaper on August 21. This column, written by John Corlett, was called Politically Speaking.

The main topic of Mr. Corlett's column concerned a speech made recently by Reclamation Commissioner Floyd Dominy at Rupert, Idaho, in which the Commissioner has evidently shown his true colors as an outright proponent of public power.

Mr. Corlett points out that Dominy said that Washington was "filled with special interest groups whose aims do not always coincide with the national interest." This columnist then correctly observes whether the national interest is something determined out of the trial and errors of the people's views or "as something dedicated by a Bureau in Washington." He goes on to observe that Dominy and the administration "has decided that federalization of the electric power industry is in the national interest."

I sincerely urge every Member of this body to read these observations by Mr. Corlett because they give a clear indication of the extent to which the man who is responsible for the Nation's reclamation program has apparently decided to scuttle the basic purpose of the program for the sake of public power. Can this be the same Floyd Dominy who gained his reputation and stature as a dedicated public servant straightening out the problems of floundering reclamation projects in the West with impartiality? Can this be the same Floyd Dominy whose apparent lack of bias prompted the former Secretary of the Interior to appoint him as Commissioner of Reclamation and prompted the present Secretary of the Interior to continue him in that capacity?

As a member of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, I have previously taken exception to some of the positions espoused by Mr. Dominy and I again take strong exception to his newly found public power attitudes expressed in the Rupert, Idaho, speech. I wonder now whether these are newly found attitudes or whether the Commissioner of Reclamation has long been masquerading as a wolf in sheep's clothing. When I think back to some of

the suggestions he made even under the previous administration with regard to the Burns Creek project and the all-Federal transmission system in the Upper Colorado River Basin, I become more and more convinced that he was a wolf in sheep's clothing.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include this column by John Corlett, which appeared in the Idaho Statesman on Sunday, August 20, in the RECORD at this point so that my thoughtful colleagues may have the opportunity of reading Mr. Corlett's observations:

POLITICALLY SPEAKING
(By John Corlett)

When Floyd Dominy spoke at Rupert Saturday, you could turn the calendar back to 1951 and 1952.

It has been obvious since President Kennedy took office last January that the policies which existed in the Department of Interior prior to 1953 when Mr. Eisenhower became Chief Executive, were simply resurrected and reinstated. Whatever happened in water resources and Federal power development in the 8 Eisenhower years were shunted into the shadows, out of sight and out of mind.

Mr. Dominy speaks in the voice of Mike Strauss, the public and Federal hydropower dedicated Commissioner of Reclamation under Mr. Truman. Before Strauss, the Bureau of Reclamation, run by engineers, hewed a fairly straight line and stuck to its business of building irrigation dams. And if the dams could generate power, well and good, but it was a byproduct.

Under Strauss, a newspaperman and public relations expert before his Government service, power became the tail that wagged the dog in consideration of reclamation projects. This policy was exemplified in the high Hells Canyon Dam, which did not irrigate a single acre, but its power was to be used to help pay for reclamation projects.

At Rupert, Dominy lost no time in raising the ghost of Hells Canyon and moaned that progress in reclamation had thereby sustained a blow.

Surely he must know that the water users of southern Idaho raised up in numbers to kill the High Hells Canyon Dam on grounds their water rights would be endangered and that the big structure was uneconomical.

This is a fight well known to Idahoans, but Dominy insists that interested Idahoans don't know what is good for them.

He brought up Mr. Truman's old bugaboo of special interests. He said Washington, D.C., was "filled with special interest groups whose aims do not always coincide with the national interest." What is the national interest? Is it something determined out of the trials and errors of the peoples' views, or is something dictated by a bureau in Washington?

Dominy and the Kennedy administration has decided that federalization of the electrical power industry is in the national interest. Wherever the people have been allowed to speak on this issue in local and regional elections they have turned down this view.

Dominy complained that the special lobbying groups distort facts or omit key facts. Does he imply that the special interest he is espousing as an official on the Federal payroll does not distort or omit facts?

The distortion and omission of facts by the Interior Department and public power groups in the High Hells Canyon case were legion and I documented many of them in the hun-

dreds of thousands of words I wrote on that issue.

The strangest words in Dominy's prepared text are in this paragraph:

"Downstream on the Snake River, below Hells Canyon, there is a war on as to whether to utilize the Mountain Sheep or Nez Perce hydroelectric sites and whether public or private utilities or the Federal Government will construct the proposed dams. But Idaho, which has the most to win or lose, is strangely silent even though this State has the biggest stake in this last use of the water before it passes beyond your boundaries."

The implication here, if not stated directly, is that Dominy is begging Idahoans to work primarily for Federal development of either one of these two sites. The Reclamation Bureau and the Interior Department has just shifted emphasis from the dead Hells Canyon Dam to High Mountain Sheep or Nez Perce.

But someone failed to keep Dominy advised. The Idaho Legislature adopted a memorial asking for the private development of High Mountain Sheep. The Idaho AFL-CIO wants High Mountain Sheep, on which the Pacific Northwest Power Co. has spent millions of dollars in preliminary development. The Idaho Wildlife Federation favors the development of High Mountain Sheep as proposed by PNP. The Lewiston area people want High Mountain Sheep.

Dominy concluded, according to his prepared text, with these words:

"Despite the loud voices of those who oppose progress, this remains a government of the people and it will be responsive to your wishes. But you must speak as one, with a unity and desire to push ahead as your forefathers did before you when the Magic Valley was purely a gleam in some visionary leader's eyes."

Well, Magic Valley was developed by private enterprise with private money. True, extra and supplemental water was made available in later years by reclamation dams at Jackson Lake, American Falls, and Pallsades. But the initial development was by private capital.

This initiative still exists. Since the end of World War II, about 350,000 acres of land have been developed in the central Idaho area by private individuals with private capital, compared to 100,000 acres developed by the Bureau.

Mr. Speaker, the editorial appearing on August 21 was entitled "They Never Give Up." It also was concerned with Commissioner Dominy's "public power trumpet bleating" at Rupert. It is particularly effective in its criticism of the Commissioner and his observations and the locale which he chose to make them.

May I remind my colleagues that this is the same Reclamation Commissioner who advised the former Secretary of the Interior to approve the all-Federal transmission system in the Upper Colorado River Basin. It should also be pointed out that the report prepared for the Secretary's consideration and upon which he made the decision was full of inadequacies and omissions which would probably have had some effect on the decision made. It is also interesting to note that it was this same Commissioner who recommended to the present Secretary of the Interior that the all-Federal transmission system be approved even though the present proposal is drastically different from the proposal supplied for Mr. Seaton's consideration.

I also commend the reading of this editorial to my colleagues:

THEY NEVER GIVE UP

It's been a long time since Idaho has heard the public power trumpet bleating in one of our outposts but the sound was loud and long at Rupert Saturday. Reclamation Commissioner Dominy, in Idaho for a land-drawing ceremony on the Minidoka project, used the opportunity to inform Idahoans that they have been traveling the wrong road, and they ought to get smart. His answer for Idaho's progress, natch, is public power.

Mr. Dominy has been on the Washington scene for some time. He is an Eisenhower appointee. We don't recall his public power activity during the pre-Kennedy times. It might just be that Mr. Dominy, testing the Washington liberal winds, and wanting to keep his job, flopped over and wanted to make sure that someone in Washington heard about it.

Had Mr. Dominy found the opportunity to go to north Idaho and make his speech, not much attention would have been paid to it. But when he went into Magic Valley and spread the word, he was like the dog that tackled the beehive. He was in the wrong place and had he investigated before he opened his mouth he would have found this out. Magic Valley has some grassroots reclamation progress that seems to have created quite an agricultural area and all of this came about before the Government got the idea it had to take over the power business. Of course Mr. Dominy could point to some acreage of the Magic Valley that is vaguely intertwined with public power but there are a whole lot of acres that came into production on the shoulders of the kind of private enterprise that still is preferred in Idaho.

What The Statesman imagines happened with Mr. Dominy's speech is that one of the former Idaho resident employees of the public power boys now in Washington was asked to write him something to say at Rupert. That was a good opportunity for a public power ghost writer but it sure left Mr. Dominy with his oratory down, assuming again that he didn't compose the dilly with all its inaccuracies, not to mention the large share of just plain bunk.

Reclamation Commissioner Dominy is supposed to represent all the people of the Nation, and all the people of Idaho. He was not assigned to his position as a crusader for public power. His compensation is paid in part by the taxes private enterprise power provides the Government. It would seem, therefore, that in addition to being a long way off base in Rupert Saturday, he is also away out in left field when he is supposed to be something of an impartial umpire.

Idaho's attitude on public power is well identified. The Hells Canyon conclusion which Mr. Dominy bemoaned, he should know could not be stomached by members of Democratic-controlled House committees. He also should know more about Burns Creek Dam than he appears to know, especially the cost information that makes this public power project the most ridiculous ever considered. He can read about it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. He can also find out why Burns Creek is stymied.

Perhaps Idaho is fortunate that she is located out in the intermountain country, considerably distant from such busybodies as Mr. Dominy. If he, and the others of his stripe, lived any nearer, it would be continually irritating whereas now it is only an occasional grinding on the private enterprise disposition of the people of an intelligent State, one ready to row its own

canoe. For in spite of Mr. Dominy, his opinion, and the opinion of others following his crusade, Idaho is getting along quite well. That will continue as long as we can keep up our guard against too much Federal Government electrical power or anything else.

Address by Paul A. Carbone, National Junior Commander of the Italian American War Veterans of the United States, Inc.

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. ALEXANDER PIRNIE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, recently I was privileged to participate in the 26th annual national convention of the Italian American War Veterans of the United States, Inc., which was held in my city of Utica, N.Y.

Among the highlights of this convention was the following address delivered at Chancellor Park incident to a memorial mass parade from the Hotel Utica to Our Lady of Mount Carmel Church. Gathered for this observance were the Honorable John A. Volpe, Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, the Honorable Frank M. Dulan, mayor of the city of Utica, National Commander Vincent Loparco, National President Angelina Tenuto, General Convention Chairman John F. Nave, National Honorary Chaplain John Positano, Convention Co-Chairman Bennie Graniero, Parade Marshal Leonard D'Amico, and several thousand delegates and Uticans.

I am glad to share this inspiring message with the Members of this House:

ADDRESS BY PAUL A. CARBONE, NATIONAL JUNIOR VICE COMMANDER OF THE ITALIAN AMERICAN WAR VETERANS OF THE UNITED STATES, INC.

It is most fitting that we gather here this morning to pay tribute to the honored dead of those citizen soldiers of Italian ancestry who have made the supreme sacrifice on behalf of their country. It is also a great honor to all of us assembled here in the name of the Italian American War Veterans of the United States, to memorialize these honored dead on the occasion of our 26th annual national convention here in the city of Utica.

Whereas in normal times of peace, such an event has taken place without undue significance and yet always with the greatest of respect, today, as we stand on the brink of perhaps another war, we carry out our bounden duty imbued with an even greater feeling of trust and obligation.

As we are assembled here this morning, at the threshold of a world crisis and contemplate the specter of other sacrifices which may be made in this and other lands, we realize fully well with an even greater emotion the impact of the phrase "our honored dead."

It is customary in a commemoration of our war dead to show our respect and honor for these heroes of the past by the symbol of this tangible wreath.

In our organization we are ever mindful of the past in order to fulfill adequately our duties of today. Our national emblem reminds us daily of our past and present duties

and responsibilities. The green-colored laurel wreath of our emblem represents peace, and the supreme sacrifice made by our departed comrades is indicated by the field of red upon which rests the laurel wreath.

We must fervently pray in order to invoke the blessings of God that the sacrifice of these honored dead shall not have been in vain and that we, as responsible citizens of today, shall have the strength and fervor to carry forth in the name of our country so that the cause of freedom and peace shall prevail.

Twenty Billion Dollars Will Not Save Latin America From Communism

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the well-known columnist, Henry J. Taylor, puts into words much better than I can at this point the fruitless gesture in the fight against the Communist conspiracy of throwing another \$20 billion into Latin America. Mr. Speaker, how long will it be and how many failures must we experience before we admit that we cannot solve all the world's problems by throwing dollars at them? What is needed to save Latin America from communism as well as the rest of the free world, is for the United States to enunciate a strong and firm foreign policy backed up by action which will free Cuba from the Communists, serve notice on Khrushchev that he risks war and defeat if he pushes his Berlin demands any further and beef up our nuclear power to support our words:

NO WAY TO RUN A RAILROAD

(By Henry J. Taylor)

Former New York City Mayor Jimmy Walker used to say, "When you don't know how to do something, praise it." This is known in more elegant circles as eulogizing the objective while you tuck the problem under the bed.

Accordingly, our U.S. delegation of 46 arm-chair conquistadores has tangoed back from Punta del Este eulogizing the alliance for progress program and, incidentally, announcing another great success. We have found some more people willing to accept \$20 billion; thereby besting Cuba again.

Anybody who does not know we want a strong, coordinated and friendly Latin America must be out of his mind. But simply eulogizing this excellent objective without any real idea how to achieve it while spending our billions raises large moral questions which in all good conscience our officials should answer.

Treasury Secretary C. Douglas Dillon remains improperly vague or silent on the method side of utilizing this money, which is the guts of the whole thing, just as did Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, Democrat, of Arkansas, in manipulating the appropriation through the Senate.

They are silent because they do not know the answer and neither does anybody else. Or perhaps, sadly, it is impossible to achieve more with new billions down there than with old billions in the past, and we should face up to that. But, in any case, this new money for itself is not the answer. Yet, when the

words all float away to the rafters this is the impression which is left. In all honesty, is that the way to run the railroad?

Again and again we rush into places and projects like this with words and the taxpayers' money, as tantalized as a blind dog in a butcher shop and without much more knowledge of what we are really doing, or how to stop, than the eager squirrel in the revolving cage.

The practice has been going on many years and has built itself into a tragic and dangerous mirage. It has led us to imagine we can do many things with dollars which dollars alone simply cannot do.

For example, the Cuban debacle was a debacle in thinking. The shabby tragedy in the Bay of Pigs has already cost us more in Latin America than this 20 billion can ever unwind. There are not enough dollars in the world to underwrite such ghastly mistakes in policy and performance. And the reckoning is here.

Nearly every time the White House sends Congress a demand for an appropriation it is pressure-propelled and promoted as absolutely vital, no matter what. It is a continuous "your money or your life" technique, which was Senator FULBRIGHT's trick, and frequently dubious. We'll never last long enough to beat communism that way.

A few days more at Punta del Este and Secretary Dillon would have thrown in the family silver. It was very expensive applause we got down there; and tentative. Several obstacles in Latin America, which face our money like a sponge faces water, require some discussion in the next article.

But without overcoming these, and no one has told us how, we will finally end up merely buying Latin America's raw materials—copper, tin, wool, timber, beef and perhaps even wheat and cotton, etc.—at a premium over the world price on the pattern of our former Cuban sugar subsidy and do very little else until we run out of money and get the same blame we got in Cuba when we stop.

Is it too much to ask that we know what we are doing ahead of time every now and then in our enormously complicated problems? If not, we will one day dollar ourselves to death, still lacking methods for success while we spend and spend and spend for objectives we praise and praise and praise.

Another Surprise Coming?

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, in the July 24, 1961, issue of the magazine *Aviation Week and Space Technology*, its editor, Mr. Robert B. Hotz, covered the very important subject of the possibility of Russia's resuming nuclear weapons testing. Because of the fact that the Russians have now announced their intention of proceeding with this testing, Mr. Hotz' editorial is of added interest. I commend to the Members of the House the contents which follow:

ANOTHER SURPRISE COMING?

(By Robert Hotz)

The Tushino air show of a few weeks ago provided a sharp surprise to the American people, who had been misled by their leaders in recent years to believe that the Soviet Union had abandoned advanced development

of manned aircraft and was concentrating solely on ballistic missiles and space weapons. These leaders in turn have been badly informed by their intelligence services, not because of the working level input but because of top-level intelligence counsel decisions to ignore evidence that did not suit their preconceived ideas of what should be transpiring.

Although Cuba and Tushino revealed some of the incredible incompetency in the use of our national intelligence estimating machinery, the full impact of this sad bureaucratic bungling has yet to be told, primarily because it is well shielded under the official stamp of secrecy.

However much of a shock it is to the American people to discover that the Red air force, which was supposed to be fading into obsolescence, had suddenly blossomed out with a full array of new generation aircraft across the whole technical spectrum from supersonic bombers and long-range interceptors to assault transports and helicopters, we wonder if an even greater shock may not be in the offing. We wonder if the self-imposed ban on nuclear testing that the United States has been operating under for the past 3 years may not be leading toward the dissipation of our once commanding lead in nuclear weapons development. Will we wake up another Monday morning soon and find that the Soviets have been secretly testing new generations of nuclear weapons when they confront us publicly with their operational capability?

This possibility has also been raised by John McCone, a California Republican who has had a long and distinguished career in Government, both in the Defense Department and as Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission. This is what he had to say on this point recently:

"Nuclear weapons development by underground and outer space testing will give to either the United States or the Soviets an arsenal of weapons, both large and small, more powerful, more versatile, and more useful in modern warfare than those now existent. The Soviets can proceed with these developments behind their walls of secrecy without detection, as no present scientific means of discovering their actions exist or can be created without inspection posts within their country and the right for on-site inspection.

"The Soviets' adamant refusal to accept a reasonable plan for policing a test ban agreement by refusing appropriate means for inspection is reason to believe they are developing new and improved weapons by clandestine testing. Thus they can develop a great military superiority, and we, respecting a self-imposed moratorium, will take second place.

"Efforts to reach agreement have now failed because of Soviet unreasonable positions. Our security is at stake. We must resume weapon testing as essential to the safety of our country and the free world. Soviet protestations that they are not interested in testing appear un dependable as similar statements were frequently made regarding manned aircraft, but now they display several new military planes secretly developed.

"Will they soon display advanced nuclear weapons?"

The initial impetus toward a nuclear test ban came from the world-wide public hysteria over nuclear fallout assiduously promoted by the Soviet Union. Admittedly, the stupid secrecy imposed by the Atomic Energy Commission on the basic facts of fallout contributed enormously to the success of the Soviet hysteria promotion and is another key example of how secrecy hurts much more than it can possibly help.

Now, however, these techniques of underground testing have been developed to the

point where considerable development work can be done by this method without any atmospheric fallout. Development of nuclear testing in outer space is certainly feasible, although considerable work on adequate instrumentation must be done before it will be practical. Here too, atmospheric fallout is eliminated.

The really important lesson to be learned from the Tushino airshow of 1961 and the fatal trap to be avoided in continuing a unilateral nuclear test ban is that in dealing with the Soviets, we must cover all technical possibilities across the board if we are to avoid the disastrous consequences of strategic surprise. There is no easy shortcut to national security in dealing with as determined and formidable an adversary as the U.S.S.R. The Soviet Union is developing every phase of its military power, from the masses of land troops reequipped with mobile missiles that move by giant helicopter or armored caterpillar launching vehicles, airborne tanks and artillery to the supersonic bombers and fighters of the air force, also armed with formidable missiles, to the ballistic missile rocket forces and finally into the military applications of outer space.

This country can no longer afford to swallow the complete untruth that our military forces are in readiness to cope with any situation the Soviets may present. In all but a few areas our state of military preparedness is extremely low.

If we are to convince either our friends or foes that we mean what we say about Berlin or any of the other crises that are certain to arise along the United States-U.S.S.R. interface, we had better stop talking about how wonderful our "wonder weapons" are and begin to actually do something about plugging the great gaps that exist in our current military power. At the same time, we must continue adequate preparations for the future development of all of the incredibly fantastic possibilities the galloping technologies of our time now reduce to the realm of probability.

Century-Old Ledger Reveals Tavern Life in 1845

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Lancaster News, Lancaster, S.C., of August 28, 1961:

FOUND IN McALLEY HOME—CENTURY-OLD LEDGER REVEALS TAVERN LIFE IN 1845

(Editor's Note.—The following article by Viola C. Floyd is a review of a century-old ledger found recently in one of Chester's oldest home sites by Frank Roberts of Lancaster Road. Mr. Roberts said he saw a for sale sign in the yard of the McAlley home on West End several months ago and decided to investigate the dwelling. In the basement, covered with coal dust, he found the old ledger and brought it by the Reporter office as the costs of the different items were a far cry from today's standards.)

(By Viola C. Floyd)

The perusal of century-old account books is a delightful diversion. An old ledger bearing the name of John T. M. McAfee, presumably of Chester, S.C., dated 1843-52

is interesting when used as a comparison for prices. The maximum charge for a dinner was 25 cents. This may seem unbelievable to one who has had the experience in modern days of stopping at some of the very attractive roadside restaurants that now dot the countryside. In most instances the prices are in line with other things. But occasionally the traveler comes out wondering why he paid \$2 for two spoonfuls of blackeyed peas, a small piece of sweet potato—beg pardon, yam—and a slice of ham through which you could see the design on the plate, plus a glass of tea flavored with leftover lemon. Can it be possible anyone ever complained of the fare received for 25 cents?

To top the 25 cent charge the ledger records the information that A. H. Davega was charged \$149.54 for board and lodging for 1 year and 2 weeks. Figured on the weekly basis that averages about \$2.75.

In those days everybody smoked "se-gars" and that was the way to spell it. Segars came at various prices. One brand sold at 6½ cents a dozen; another at 37½ cents a dozen. Doctors seemed to prefer the latter brand. Dr. Dunovant bought "one fourth box of segars" for which he was charged \$6.25.

The most foreign sounding name was the account of Fes Charner De Graffenreid. Thomas De Graffenreid paid \$96 with 16,000 brick on a \$205 account. In 1853, he settled the total bill which was for board and lodging for self, wife, two servants and three horses.

The tavern was a stopping place during court week. The vouchers given jurors were used in payments. "Dinner for self and horse, 50 cents" or "bed for self and horse were" were entries. Share and share alike.

Drinks were the leading item charged. There was a choice of Jamaica rum, whisky, brandy, wine, gin or beer. Usually the price ran from 6¼ to 12½ cents per drink. Dudley Culp took a "julep".

A gallon of peach brandy sold for \$1; a quart of "cog. brandy" for \$1; and madeira at \$4 per gallon.

During the course of 2 years Matthew Williams ran up an account for \$27.45 for segars, whisky and brandy—and left the bill unpaid.

John W. Owen had a fondness for klasses. He bought 12½ cents worth on December 30, 1845 then returned the same day for 25 cents worth more. Popular with the girls or a house full of children?

Harry Kennedy had a taste for oysters, herring and crackers—plus brandy. He sometimes ate as many as three plates of oysters at the time. (If three different people ate dinners all charged to one person that was carefully recorded.)

The Lafayette Lodge No. 8 confined its purchases to "cans of oil" for which it settled in cash.

In lieu of cash, payment was often made in goods. A calf skin brought a credit of \$2. A 26-pound green hide was given credit of \$1.30 and a dry hide of 15 pounds brought \$1.50. The tavern sold the byproduct of hair at the rate of so much per bushel.

Twenty-two loads of wood brought \$16.50, or 75 cents per load; O. P. Farrar hauled 29 loads at 62½ cents per load and 21 loads at 18½ cents per load.

James K. Reedy was given credit for \$12 on three cords of bark used for tanning. Slave labor could be used for credit. William A. Lewis paid his bill with "4 days hire of Jim" at 46 cents per day and "4 days hire of Charles" at 75 cents per day.

Fodder brought three-fourths cent per pound. (The fraction of a cent was used frequently in all accounts.) One man exchanged \$46.76¼ worth of beef for drinks of whisky, brandy, gin, and wine. Two lambs brought \$1.75 and two pigs with a total weight of 85 pounds brought \$4.25—5 cents a pound.

W. Perry Gill seldom put drinks on his account and if he did, it was apparently when he treated a group. His bills were paid in cash.

Even an old copper still brought \$4.50. John Gill built a "Little House" for the tavern and was credited \$10 for same. Eli Hamilton was given \$4.50 "by hide receipts." Robinson Bradley charged an account of \$101.23 during 1844-46 but paid the bill in full in 1852.

Peter Wylie, the County Ordinary, settled his entire bill in green hides. Tailors charged, then exchanged, sewing. James Aiken's credit of \$2 for work done on a coffin was canceled by a line drawn through the record. Tavern owner's health improve?

A. B. Holbrook paid \$5 cash on a \$14.68 account. Dr. Carter Lee paid \$37.50 on an account of \$278.37½. The "balance of Act. forgiven." Family physician?

Between two and three hundred accounts are in the ledger, all beautifully written and accurately kept. Among other names found are such familiar ones as: Patterson, Pratt, Reed, Miller, Pardue, Ford, Cornwell, Lathan, Beckham, Hardin, Roberts, Love, Lowery, Kirk, Gibbs, Ross, Steenson, Adams, Walker, Carroll, Pride, Bennett, Nelson, Howser, McClintock, Neal, Able, Wright, Johnston, Sadler, Simpson, Parrott, Lattimer, Williamson, Jennings, Dye, Gilmore, Hammond, McNinch, Hicklin, Bratton, McDonald, Gladden, Price, Darby, Simril, Parks, Byers, Boyd, Robinson, Beam, Orr, Henry, Land, Woods, Meek, Wilkes, Kirkpatrick, McClure, Love, and Stroud.

Commonsense in Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, our colleague from Connecticut, the Honorable JOHN S. MONAGAN, has long been recognized as an advocate of the improvement of our election laws. He has written many enlightening articles which have been published in the Nation's press, and he has spoken eloquently in support of legislation sponsored by him to abbreviate presidential election campaigns.

His efforts in the interest of the public and for the health and welfare of the candidates themselves have attracted national attention.

With unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD a comment on Mr. MONAGAN's program made by Mr. Morgan Beatty in his "News of the World" program carried by the National Broadcasting Co. on August 23, 1961:

NEWS OF THE WORLD, AUGUST 23, 1961
MR. MONAGAN AND THE ROADBLOCK AGAINST
COMMONSENSE IN POLITICS

For several years now an alert and enterprising Congressman from Connecticut has been campaigning his political fingers down to the quick for a reform that 90 percent of the voters approve.

JOHN S. MONAGAN has been fighting for a short presidential election campaign and a remodeling of the "Roman circuses" called national political conventions.

Tonight he has decided to challenge the roadblock that has stopped him cold. He mapped out a plan to persuade the power-

ful Judiciary Committee to spring his two bills to the House floor for debate and action. They provide, either by constitutional amendment or by plain legislation, to forbid any candidate for President to start campaigning before September the 1st on election year. This would reduce the 3 months of hullabaloo to 60 days. Sparking the Congressman's decision is an article appearing tomorrow in the current McCall's magazine. Author Robert W. Sarnoff, chairman of the board, National Broadcasting Co. Mr. Sarnoff points out that the present long campaign was a part of the stovepipe locomotive era. In that day William Jennings Bryan had to huff and puff along 18,000 miles to make 600 speeches and reach only 5 million voters. In the last campaign, says Mr. Sarnoff with the help of radio and TV both candidates spoke to 120 million Americans, coast to coast on four different evenings in a mere 4 hours. What's more President Kennedy has assured the Nation he will face his next opponent if he is renominated in the same way. The Sarnoff idea is the chairman of the two political parties should work out an agreement for a shorter campaign beginning as late as mid-September.

Mr. MONAGAN wants to put the force of law behind the idea. Surveys show 90 percent of the people want shorter campaigns. Mr. MONAGAN suspects some of the old line pros in both parties, some of whom date back to the stovepipe locomotive, oppose the short campaign because, well, some say Truman would have lost in 1943 if he had had to shorten his "give 'em hell campaign." Maybe a Republican would want extra time in the next campaign. But the pressure is on—and it's building toward a modern and dignified appeal to the voters.

Naval Shipyards Provide Essential Support to Vessels of the U.S. Navy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, a short time ago Rear Adm. R. K. James, Chief of the Bureau of Ships, speaking before the Naval Civilian Administrators Association in Washington, D.C., discussed the Navy's position with regard to the current plight of the private shipbuilding industry. I believe that my colleagues will be interested to read excerpts of that speech which I am inserting in the Appendix of the RECORD:

NAVAL SHIPYARDS PROVIDE ESSENTIAL SUPPORT TO VESSELS OF THE U.S. NAVY

As of January 1, 1961, a naval ship construction and conversion program having a total cost of over \$4,323,000,000 was under contract with private yards. Thirty-one private shipbuilding firms throughout the country are participating in this program.

This contributes importantly to the economic well-being of the shipbuilding and repair industry. It is unfortunately true that many commercial shipyards are in a depressed condition and some have closed and still others face bankruptcy today. The primary cause of the difficulties does not rest with the Navy.

One of the least publicized, but one of the most obvious reasons for the difficulties experienced by the private shipbuilders has

been a decline in commercial ship construction and repair work. Insofar as employment is concerned, private yard employment on Navy work has increased from 26,069 in 1957 to 41,743 in 1960.

Nevertheless, in spite of this increased employment on Navy work, overall employment in private shipyards went down from 127.1 to 117.5 thousand in the same period. This pinpoints the cause of the industries' reduced operation—a decline in commercial work.

I can offer no panaceas for the commercial shipbuilding industry, but I do not think it is reasonable to hold the Navy responsible for their plight. In the allocation of Navy shipwork we have always shown and continue to show great concern for maintaining the mobilization potential represented by private shipyards.

We must, however, retain flexibility in determining how much naval ship work can be advantageously apportioned to private yards, without destroying an important part of our military potential—our naval shipyards.

Naval shipyards have a long and illustrious history dating back to 1797 when the Naval Committee of the House of Representatives recommended that a sum be appropriated for a proper site for a Navy yard. Following the Appropriation Act of 1799, the Secretary of the Navy purchased sites for the shipyards at Norfolk, Washington, D.C., Philadelphia, New York, Charleston, Mass., and Portsmouth, N.H.

An act of Congress on August 31, 1852, authorized and directed the Secretary of the Navy to select a site for a Navy yard in the San Francisco Bay area. Every single one of the naval shipyards was established in this manner by the Congress acting for the people of the United States. Each of the naval shipyards has been, since establishment, the subject of continual congressional approval by inclusion in the various appropriation acts of funds for their maintenance, improvement, and in many cases, their expansion.

The reason for the establishment of all of these naval shipyards was to provide essential support for the vessels of the U.S. Navy.

Let me reemphasize the point I have just made. If the naval shipyards are in competition with private shipyards, it is an accidental and incidental result of the necessity, as determined by the Congress, to maintain the naval shipyards to support the fleet. The overriding consideration must be the effective support of a strong Navy. The naval shipyards do not exist at the whim of any person or group of persons in the Navy. They are an essential element of national defense.

Let's spend just a minute recounting the factors that make the naval shipyards "an essential element of national defense." In doing so be warned that a strict listing of the factors is not inspiring—at least to a layman's confidence in the unlimited capability of private industry.

The understanding that you, as experienced shipyarders have, is needed to fill out this outline—to give it real meaning. For example, our detractors have failed to mention the effect their quest for more conversion and repair work would have on ships' personnel. We can reply that our naval bases have the facilities needed to give these men an opportunity for recreation, for training, for medical and dental care, for church-going and for welfare.

Further, we can state that the low bidder would rarely, if ever, be located in a place where such services would be readily available for our shipboard personnel. We know that this is true and we know that our men and ships need such services, if they are to operate at top efficiency.

However, the typical layman does not personally benefit from such services and is

not personally in a position to evaluate their effect. You are in such a position based on your personal contact and experiences.

I am sure you appreciate the great importance of having ships assigned whenever possible to the ship's homeport to permit the morale building effects of family life. Under competitive bidding practices, as I have indicated, the assignments to homeports would have to be abandoned, as this work would have to go to the lowest bidder.

The naval shipyards maintain the messing and berthing facilities to service ships' crews who must be billeted or fed ashore as is very often required during the course of overhauls. This is another reason for performing this work in naval shipyards.

To move along quickly, our reasons include the facts that:

We are oriented in producing quality work on time and, thus, our efforts can be readily integrated with fleet operational schedules.

We carry an extensive inventory of shipboard equipment and spare parts in our shipyards which permits us to finish work expeditiously.

We do not go out on strike, which means the fleet can depend on us at all times.

We maintain facilities and capabilities which would not be economic in a profit type organization but which permit us to take on any job with adequate reserve.

For good and sufficient reasons we do not normally prepare for repair and alteration work, plans and specifications adequate for comparative bidding.

Other similar reasons you could list as well as I.

As I indicated above, the problem is to get an understanding of the validity of these reasons, and they are valid. Further, any efforts in this direction must be completely ethical and within any administrative restrictions.

I believe you will note that for each of these reasons I have listed above our detractors can provide a counterargument—usually in the form of an assumption that they will do in their normal course of business something they have never done before. I am convinced that the effectiveness of the fleet will be greatly reduced if its support is turned over to profit making organizations which cannot have, unless heavily subsidized, the same motivation towards service that you people in this room have.

The naval shipyards do not operate for profit but function wholly to support the naval forces operating at sea. We are staffed and equipped just for this purpose. On the other hand, private shipyards need not maintain a similar level of skills and facilities.

Private yards' skills and facilities are controlled by economic analysis with the greatest profit in mind and for this same reason they tend to pick and choose the work they will do. The naval shipyards, on the other hand accept all jobs and perform them quickly, promptly and as economically as possible. I think it is important to reemphasize the capabilities possessed by the naval shipyards to perform extremely complex and difficult repair and alteration work expeditiously and at the same time, to properly service the ships' crews.

tee's study project, Operation Employment, a number of facets of the employment question were discussed. In the process of making that study, one major emphasis was on the problems of progress, the fact that the dynamism of our economy has brought about severe manpower shortages in the skilled labor categories at the same time the economic value of other skills has been lost through new procedures and new machines. Herbert Hill, the labor secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, recently addressed himself to that matter, and the related matter of discrimination in employment, in his testimony before the House Committee on Education and Labor on H.R. 8219. Mr. Hill's statement is a significant one and I believe that it deserves wide attention. For this reason, I am placing it in the RECORD at this point:

STATEMENT OF HERBERT HILL, OF NEW YORK, N.Y., LABOR SECRETARY OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF COLORED PEOPLE, BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, AUGUST 22, 1961

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my name is Herbert Hill and I am labor secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People whose national office is located in New York City at 20 West 40th Street. I wish, first of all, to thank the committee for this opportunity to appear and to comment on the bill relating to apprenticeship training now under consideration.

I appear in support of H.R. 8219 which proposes to withdraw Federal support and approval from apprenticeship programs which operate on a discriminatory racial basis.

We strongly urge the passage of this bill because we believe that the Federal Government and all of its agencies must as a matter of basic policy withhold its sanction and its financial support from apprenticeship training and other programs refusing to admit Negroes and members of other minority groups.

Today, the American economy is characterized by a great paradox in relation to manpower utilization, for in the midst of the serious rise in unemployment during the past 2 years many jobs are going begging because of a lack of skilled workers. Even in such a critically jobless area as Detroit and other industrial communities where there has been a continuous and alarming rate of unemployment, industry has been unable to find an adequate supply of skilled craft workers and there is every indication that this problem will continue to become ever more serious.

For every 100 skilled workers that the Nation had in 1955 it will need 122 in 1965 and 145 in 1975, yet all of the available data clearly indicates that the Nation's apprenticeship programs as well as other training programs are not even turning out enough new craftsmen to replace those who retire. Automation and other technological changes in the economy have greatly increased the demand for skilled workers and currently, the large appropriations for national defense also significantly increase the demand for skilled workers and technicians. It is now clear that in the next decade the entire American economy will be faced with a serious crisis because of the lack of skilled manpower.

A major factor contributing to the irrational, wasteful and socially harmful operation of the Nation's apprenticeship training programs is the color discrimination and racial exclusion which characterize ap-

prenticeship training programs in major sectors of the economy in the North as well as in the South. Discrimination in apprenticeship training programs is also greatly responsible for the fact that for the past 3 years Negro unemployment has been almost consistently two or three times greater than the total unemployment rate and that nonwhite workers today make up a very large portion of the hard core permanently unemployed group in American society. In Chicago, 17.3 percent of Negro workers are jobless whereas 5.7 percent is the community's total unemployment rate; in Detroit, with over 185,000 unemployed, 112,000 are Negro; 10 percent of the Negro work force in New York City is unemployed compared to 6.4 percent of the total work force; in Pittsburgh, 24 percent of Negro workers are unemployed as against 11.6 percent for the community total; in St. Louis, Mo., the unemployment rate is 8.4 percent while Negro unemployment is 20 percent; in Philadelphia, Negro unemployment is 28 percent as against the total unemployment rate of 7 percent; in Gary, Ind., Negro unemployment is 44 percent while 6.3 percent is the rate of unemployment for the community and in Columbus, Ohio, where the total unemployment figure is 5.6 percent, Negro unemployment is over 10 percent.

The current status of the Negro wage earner is characterized by drastic change and crisis. Many traditional sources of Negro employment as on the Nation's railroads and in mass production industries are rapidly disappearing as a result of automation and other technological changes in the economy. The fact that there is such a great concentration of Negroes in the ranks of the unskilled and semiskilled means that the increasing introduction of advanced methods of production causes the large scale displacement of Negroes previously employed in unskilled jobs. Already one can cite many instances where a highly trained white man and a new machine have replaced a significant number of unskilled Negro workers. The virtual exclusion of Negroes from apprenticeship and other training programs forces them to remain as marginal employees in the economy and directly affects the economic well-being of the entire Negro community as it removes potential sources of stable employment in high-income occupations from the group.

For many occupations the only way a worker can be recognized as qualified for employment is to successfully complete apprenticeship training programs. This is true for the printing trades, among machinists and metalworkers, in the various crafts in the building and construction trades industry and many others. By apprenticeship we mean registered programs that consist of formal on-the-job training and related classroom instruction in the theory, content and techniques of a great variety of skilled craft occupations involving a minimum of 4,000 hours of instruction with a rising scale of wages for each 1,000 hours of participation.

Recent studies such as that made by the New York State Commission Against Discrimination, as well as by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, clearly indicate that no significant advances have been made by Negroes in those craft union apprenticeship training programs which have historically excluded nonwhites. An examination of available data makes evident that less than one percent of the apprentices in the building and construction industry throughout the United States are Negro. In the 10-year period, 1950-60 in the State of New York, the increase of Negro participation in building trades apprenticeship programs rose only from 1.5 percent to 2 percent. The executive secretary of the NAACP, Roy Wilkins, recently stated that "given a continuation of present rates of advance, it will take Negroes 138 years, or until the year 2094

Discrimination in Employment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in the recent Republican Policy Commit-

to secure equal participation in skilled craft training and employment. Surely this condition will not be accepted by Negroes and we hope it will not be countenanced by others."

Open access to plumbing and pipefitting apprenticeship controlled by the Plumbers Union is a very rare experience for young Negroes in the North as well as in the South. Similarly Negro youth are almost completely excluded from apprenticeship programs operated by the Sheet Metal Workers Union, the Lathers and Plasterers Union, the Ornamental and Structural Iron Workers Union and from other craft unions operating in the construction industry.

Among the most important of the building trades craft unions is the Carpenters Union which has severely limited the opportunities of colored craftsmen by organizing segregated Negro locals (in those instances where Negroes are permitted to join) and giving them jurisdiction over areas where there was little or no construction or prospect of construction. In addition, Negro locals are subjected to jurisdictional raids by all-white units, these latter being much better situated in terms of resources and power. This is true both in southern and northern areas where the jurisdiction of the Negro local is usually limited to the Negro ghetto, and therefore, Negro carpenters are barred from employment on the major construction projects. As a consequence, many Negro carpenters have left the trade entirely.

The railroad craft unions as well as the railroad operating brotherhoods remain adamant in their opposition to Negro craftsmen and openly bar apprenticeship opportunities to Negro youth. Almost equally exclusive are the printing trades unions. In a survey made by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People of the seven major New York City newspapers, we find that with the exclusion of building services and maintenance personnel, less than 1 percent of those employed on the major newspapers are Negro. Virtually all of the Negroes employed on these newspapers are in the white collar jurisdiction of the New York Newspaper Guild.

We estimate that less than one-half of 1 percent of those currently employed in the newspaper crafts outside of the guild's jurisdiction are Negroes. This includes printing pressmen, compositors, photoengravers, stereotypers, paper handlers, mailers, and delivery drivers. As far as apprenticeship training for these crafts are concerned we have been unable to detect a single instance where Negroes have been recently admitted into a training program in the newspaper crafts in the city of New York or in other major cities in the United States. Primarily, these craft unions are motivated by a continuing security consciousness and are opposed to any lessening of restrictions on the number of craftsmen employed in a given trade. Exclusive control is perceived as being directly beneficial to craft unions in the collective bargaining process and the expansion of the supply of artisans is still thought to be essentially detrimental to union power. Thus, potential Negro craftsmen are prominently among those denied opportunities in these fields.

In the recent report entitled "Made in New York: Case Studies in Metropolitan Manufacturing," published by Harvard University, we are told that "Negro and Puerto Rican women who are on the lower rungs of the city's economic ladder, have become important in the New York garment industry, but they work mainly in the more standardized branches and with few exceptions . . . they do not become highly skilled tailor-system workers on dresses or 'cloaks.' As a result, a shortage of skilled sewing machine operators is developing."

A recent study made by the Council for Civic Unity of San Francisco revealed that

Negroes are not participating in the electrical, plumbing, and carpentry apprenticeship training programs in that city and that only one Negro served as an apprentice in the metal trades. A report made by the Michigan Fair Employment Practices Commission entitled "A Study of Employment, Training and Placement Patterns in the Michigan Area" indicates the exclusion of Negro youth in the structural steel, sheet metal, lathers, and tile setters apprenticeship programs in Kalamazoo, Grand Rapids, and Muskegon. The Connecticut Commission on Civil Rights has published a study entitled "The Training of Negroes in the Skilled Trades," which concludes that a similar condition exists in virtually the entire State of Connecticut. In a study entitled "Negro Employment Practices in the Chattanooga Area" it was found that there was an absolute ban on apprenticeship opportunities for Negroes in the building trades and other reports indicate that the same condition exists in many other Southern States. A major factor contributing to the permanently depressed status of Negro workers in the South is that in the new industrial centers rapidly developing in the Southern States the technical training programs offered in the segregated Negro vocational schools are extremely limited and frequently were found to be obsolete in terms of modern industrial technology.

In Fort Wayne, Ind., not a single Negro participates in the apprenticeship training programs conducted by either the electricians union, the Plumbers & Steam Fitters or the Mason & Plasterers Unions; in Milwaukee, we are unable to find a single Negro in apprenticeship training and the same holds true for Minneapolis in relation to the building trades, the printing trades and the metal crafts industry. In Newark, N.J., where there are 3,523 apprentices currently participating in approved apprenticeship training programs there are exactly 2 Negroes enrolled; in New Orleans, not a single Negro apprentice is to be found in electrical installation, plumbing, painting and other building trades apprenticeship programs; in Philadelphia, less than 4 percent of the apprenticeship trades are accessible to qualified Negroes; in St. Louis, Mo., there are no Negro apprentices in the following training programs: electrical, plumbing and steamfitting, carpentry, masonry, cement finishers, lathers and painters. There is one Negro apprentice at a nonunion Negro-owned sheet-metal company. It is estimated that there are exactly 14 Negro apprentices in St. Louis. These are: six bakers, one bricklayer, two machinists, one sheetmetal worker and four meat cutters; in Tulsa, Okla., not a single Negro apprentice; in Springfield, Ill., not a single Negro enrolled in any registered apprenticeship training program; in Warren, Ohio, there are no Negro apprentices in the building and construction trades crafts; in Washington, D.C., there are no Negro apprentices in the following crafts: electrical, plumbing and steamfitting, masonry, lathing, and plastering. However, there is one Negro in the carpenters' apprenticeship program. This data is indicative of the national pattern.

In most of these programs the role of the labor union is decisive because the trade union usually determines who is admitted into the training program and, therefore, who is admitted into the union. There appears to be a complete lack of uniformity in local union apprenticeship practices even within a given international union. Thus, the constitution of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers (a major offender in this regard), dated July 1956, page 46, section 15, reads: "Each local union has power to adopt its own apprenticeship training or helper rules as the condition of each community may require. But after apprentice or helper has worked 6 months un-

der the sponsorship or jurisdiction of a local union he shall be admitted or initiated into the IBEW through the local union and the local union shall send to the international secretary per capita tax as provided in article X."

Most frequently apprentices are indentured by joint labor-management apprenticeship committees which are established in many crafts and industries where this organizational form provides the most practical method of sponsoring skilled craft training. Joint apprenticeship committees are usually composed of equal numbers of management, labor, and public representatives in any given trade. For all practical purposes, however, joint apprenticeship committees are very frequently controlled by the labor organization and represents the interests of particular craft unions in formal training systems. This appears to be especially true in the building trades where joint apprenticeship committees predominate.

Craft unions also play an important role in the recruitment and selection of apprentices through their relationship to employer indenturing units. These relationships may range from simple acquiescence in management's choice of apprentices, to unilateral selection of apprentices by the craft union as in Cleveland where apprentices are directly indentured to Local 38 of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers.

Labor unions also exercise control over apprenticeship manpower through its ability to dispatch apprentices via hiring hall procedures in de facto closed shop situations. In these circumstances, craft unions have the power to either promote or prevent the admission of individuals or of an entire class of persons.

By means of these controls, craft unions are frequently the decisive factor in the recruitment process in many apprenticeship programs and often directly prevent Negro youth from becoming skilled craft workers via the established route of apprenticeship.

A careful analysis of most apprenticeship training programs currently operating in the printing trades, the metal crafts, the construction industry, and in many other skilled craft occupations will clearly indicate the utter lack of a system of objective standard criteria for admission into apprenticeship training. At the present time there is no objective basis for determining admissions. Persons are admitted or not admitted because of nepotism and the caprices of certain union officials acting in collusion with management. The Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training of the U.S. Department of Labor in certifying apprenticeship programs in effect provides the sanction of the U.S. Government for a variety of anti-social practices of which racial discrimination is one important aspect.

On the level of the small shop and local union, the tradition of racial discrimination has now become deeply institutionalized. A form of caste psychology impels many workers to regard their own positions as "white men's job," to which no Negro should aspire. These workers and, often, their union leaders, regard jobs in their industries as a kind of private privilege, to be accorded and denied by them as they see fit. Often, Negroes are not alone in being barred from such unions, which attempt to maintain an artificial labor shortage. This is especially true of trade unions in the building and construction industry and printing trades, which have much of the character of the medieval guild. On the local level, the tradition which sustains discrimination is to be found among skilled workers in big industry as well as among craftsmen, and in the North almost as commonly as in the South.

The discriminatory policies and practices of craft unions described here are in direct contravention of 24 State statutes which prohibit the barring of employment oppor-

tunities on the basis of race or color. They appear also to be in opposition to the intent of Executive orders prohibiting discriminatory employment practices in the fulfillment of Federal Government contracts. Clearly, this is in direct violation of the ethic of a democratic trade union movement operating in a free society.

But the record will clearly indicate that the national labor federation and the affiliated old-line craft unions have refused to tackle this problem seriously and they have not to any significant degree eliminated the traditional national pattern of Negro exclusion from trade union controlled apprenticeship training programs in a variety of skilled craft occupations. The repeated protests of Negro workers from all over the country as well as the detailed reports and requests for action made by the NAACP and other civil rights organizations to the AFL-CIO have proved to be a futile exercise. Therefore, it is absolutely essential that the Federal Government, acting through the Department of Labor, assume its proper responsibility in this urgent matter by refusing to subsidize with public funds racial discrimination in apprenticeship training programs. The passage of H.R. 8219 is not to be regarded as a substitute for the vitally needed Federal fair employment practices legislation, but if vigorously and intelligently enforced it could have a very real effect in eliminating discriminatory racial practices in the Nation's apprenticeship training programs.

Recently the NAACP secured the admission of a Negro for the first time into the sheet metal apprenticeship training program in St. Louis, Mo. In an unusual procedure, the association secured certification from the Bureau of Apprenticeship of the U.S. Department of Labor for a nonunion firm owned by a Negro. This occurred after local 36 of the Sheet Metal Workers International Association had repeatedly refused to admit Negro applicants into its apprenticeship training program and had prevented the participation of the Negro-owned company in apprenticeship training programs conducted by the industry. The owner of this company (Kennedy and Sons Sheet Metal Shops), offered to have his employees join local 36 of the Sheet Metal Workers Union but the membership applications of the Negro workers were refused by the all-white local affiliate of the AFL-CIO.

Recent action by the New York State attorney general, acting at the request of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, made possible the admission of the first Negro into the apprenticeship training program operated by the Plumbers Union in the State of New York.

A sustained program of activity by the Oregon Fair Employment Practices Commission and the State apprenticeship council resulted in the admission of Negroes for the first time into various apprenticeship programs conducted by unions affiliated to the Oregon AFL-CIO Building Trades and the Metal Trades Councils. These isolated actions, however, are completely inadequate as they do not eliminate the broad national pattern of Negro exclusion from apprenticeship training programs.

Increasingly, apprenticeship and other forms of technical training become the heart of fair employment practices. The continued exclusion of Negro youth from such programs, especially those controlled by AFL-CIO craft unions in the printing industry, the building and metal trades and in other craft jurisdictions, prevents thousands of young persons from realizing their full human potential and dooms them and their families to a marginal economic existence. It is in this area that the disparity between the public relations pronouncements of the AFL-CIO on civil rights and the day-to-day

reality for Negro workers is most sharply outlined.

Federal and State agencies perform a variety of functions directly and indirectly in the operation of apprenticeship training programs. The National Apprentice Training Act (Public Law 308, known as the Fitzgerald Act) was passed in 1937 and established the Apprentice Training Service as a constituent unit of the U.S. Department of Labor. In 1942, an Executive order transferred the Service to the War Manpower Commission. In September 1945 the Apprentice Training Service was returned to the Department of Labor by Executive order and is now called the Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training.

In several instances there are industrywide apprenticeship committees. Among the most important of these are to be found the general committee on apprenticeship for the construction industry consisting of leading representatives of contractor and labor organizations which acts as a coordinating body for apprentice training for all branches of the construction industry and helps to promote the development of national and local apprentice training programs. A number of national employer associations and trade unions have set up apprenticeship committees which meet as joint labor-management committees to develop national trade and apprenticeship standards and to encourage local employer and trade union affiliates to establish training programs in conformity with the national standards.

Federal, State, and local governments can make a decisive contribution to eliminating discriminatory racial practices in the operation of apprenticeship programs by immediately withholding all forms of support from discriminatory apprenticeship training and insisting on nondiscrimination as a basic criteria for certification as an accepted and registered apprenticeship program.

The Bureau of Apprenticeship Training of the U.S. Department of Labor, in giving certification to an apprenticeship program, provides the legal basis for public subsidies to apprenticeship programs. The Federal Government, through grants-in-aid coming from the U.S. Office of Education of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, provides funds which subsidize apprenticeship training programs in many States. The Federal Government, therefore, is directly subsidizing discrimination in the skilled trades whenever a trade union or employer excludes Negroes and members of other minority groups from admission into a registered apprenticeship training program.

State governments also provide a variety of public subsidies in the operation of these programs, and municipal and county boards of education in thousands of communities across the country subsidize offending apprenticeship programs by permitting the use of public school buildings, providing instructors, power and materials as well as in a variety of other ways.

As is apparent, Federal, State, and local governments are significantly involved in the operation of apprenticeship training and very much so in terms of providing the essential subsidies without which most of these programs could not operate. It is equally clear that governmental agencies have not, with very few exceptions, exercised their considerable power to assure that apprenticeship training programs are open to all youths regardless of race, creed, color, or national origin.

The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People believes that Federal and State agencies must as a matter of basic policy refuse certification and withhold funds and other forms of subsidization from apprenticeship training programs refusing to admit Negroes or members of other minority groups, that municipal and county boards of

education immediately withdraw all forms of support from discriminatory apprenticeship programs including the use of vocational school buildings and other facilities; that management institute fair employment policies and insure their fulfillment by subordinate employees and that the great industrial corporations operating with U.S. Government contracts must begin to comply with Federal Executive orders prohibiting bias in employment.

We further believe that apprenticeship agencies have the responsibility of establishing an atmosphere of equality of opportunity in which integration may be achieved by individual apprenticeship units especially in the matter of recruitment procedures and the establishment of objective standards which will be uniformly applied in accepting or rejecting applicants.

All of the foregoing should take place in the context of full employment and economic growth and should be given the highest priority by the basic institutions of American society, with the understanding that there is an urgent need to make possible the complete realization of the abilities and talents of all of our citizens if the United States is to continue to function as a powerful and free nation in a world where industrial power is decisive.

Private Funds Spark Urban Renewals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 14, 1961

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I am including herewith an article which indicates that all urban renewal projects are not promoted and financed by the Federal Government although in the recently passed omnibus housing bill \$2,500 million of Federal funds were authorized for this purpose.

This article indicates that much of these funds are not necessary if proper measures are used to promote private interests to develop urban renewal projects:

PRIVATE FUNDS SPARK URBAN RENEWAL

NEW YORK.—Urban renewal in metropolitan downtown areas, once considered an exclusive function of government, now is being sparked in many cities by private capital, according to Robert A. Futterman, president of the publicly held \$70 million realty corporation which bears his name.

"This trend toward private investment in urban renewal is especially prevalent in communities which have actively solicited such financing to improve their downtown commercial cores," Mr. Futterman declared.

His company, which owns and operates 34 major properties in 23 cities in the United States, now is an active participant in large-scale rehabilitation ventures in Atlanta, Ga., and downtown Akron, Ohio, and Norfolk, Va.

"Private sponsorship of urban renewal for investment purposes is on the upswing throughout the country," said Mr. Futterman. "Utilities, insurance companies, unions, manufacturing concerns, and individual investors are participating in ever-increasing numbers."

Some of the rehabilitation and renewal projects in which private capital has assumed the leadership are located in Los Angeles, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, New York, Chicago, and Washington. Other aggressive metro-

politan communities, such as Houston, Minneapolis, Atlanta, and Kansas City, have projects either underway or on the drawing board.

Mr. Fatterman noted that as a long-range investment urban-renewal projects are proving attractive to large manufacturing corporations because they provide a mass-exposure showcase for new products. Alcoa and Reynolds Aluminum are moving their money into urban-renewal projects in Los Angeles and Philadelphia, where some of their new products will be utilized in construction.

"The key to future investments in this field is the profit factor," asserted Mr. Fatterman. "Privately sponsored urban renewal is not new—Rockefeller Plaza, for example, dates back to the 1930's. However, this practice has been limited largely because private investors find it unproductive to tie their capital in with low-return housing projects which constituted the bulk of urban-renewal activities in the past."

Within recent years, however, opportunities have risen for private sources to finance commercial redevelopment ventures, containing centrally located stores, office buildings, hotels, and luxury apartment buildings. In these instances, an investor can anticipate a good return while at the same time performing a public service.

One of the Nation's leading exponents of downtownism, Mr. Fatterman feels that too little has been done on a national scale in this area of redevelopment.

Just a Little Law Enforcement Will Help Cut the Cost of National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, from the Saturday Evening Post of August 26 comes the following:

With Hawaii and Puerto Rico threatened by serious food shortages and the ports of our coastal cities faced with a disastrous paralysis of shipping, President Kennedy reluctantly invoked the provision of the Taft-Hartley Act that calls for a cooling-off period of 80 days and a resumption of work while a commission appointed by the President looks into the causes of the strike. The Nation breathed a tentative sigh of relief.

But the President, in his statement on the subject, deplored the absence of a statute more flexible than Taft-Hartley and promised to suggest modifications to Congress later on. And Secretary of Labor Goldberg described the decision to enforce the law as distasteful. From all this apologetic reluctance one might get the impression that National Maritime Union leader Curran was to be put on the rack and tormented with thumbscrews and hot pincers. Actually all that was happening was an 80-day stay of execution from a sentence of economic stagnation imposed on the Nation by a small group of irresponsible labor leaders for an object that employers could not grant if they wished to. Instead of expressing reluctance and distaste, our national leaders might better have given thanks that their previous efforts to defeat and discredit this essential statute had not been successful.

The consequences of this tendency to take our blessings sourly were dramatically illustrated at the Cape Canaveral missile base,

the scene of outrageous extortion and gouging by unions, as developed by Senator JOHN MCCLELLAN's subcommittee on investigations. Because the unions at this base had control of the hiring of individual workers, vital projects were held up while wiring already installed was ripped out and installed over again by the "right" union. It was the judgment of many responsible observers that, but for such conscienceless gouging, Commander Shepard might well have made his flight into space before Russia's Maj. Yuri Gagarin accomplished his feat.

Except for failure to enforce protective legislation, none of this scandalous racketeering need have happened. Florida has a clause in its constitution which states that "the right of a person to work shall not be denied or abridged on account of membership or nonmembership in any labor union or organization." Had this provision been enforced, no union could deny the right to work at the Canaveral missile base to nonmembers of a union, any more than employers could deny the right to work to union members. What happened was that closed-shop unions moved in early and threatened to walk off the job en masse if nonunion workers were employed. A total of 23 stoppages for a total of 9,045 man-days occurred to enforce this illegal monopoly. The result was that nonunion workers and firms that employed them were excluded from the base, leaving the field open to the gougers.

It is true that Florida seems not to have passed legislation specifically stating how its constitutional right-to-work clause could be enforced. But Senator CARL CURTIS, of Nebraska, a member of the McClellan subcommittee, insisted that Florida officials had ample authority to proceed by injunction and otherwise to curb these vicious practices. Why were these powers unused? Behind the many excuses is the reluctance of officialdom to enforce any restrictions on the monopolistic practices of union leaders until the Nation is faced with a crisis or collapse."

Corps of Hope

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, the Peace Corps offers a splendid, challenging, and exciting opportunity for utilizing some of the vast reservoir of latent talents among our young people to promote and create better understanding between the United States and other nations of the world, particularly the so-called underdeveloped countries. While material economic assistance is of great importance, how greatly this could be enhanced by the personal touch of the United States extending a friendly, helping and understanding hand via the personal representation and direct participation of the able, earnest and dedicated young American men and women in our Peace Corps.

While it has often been said that it is important that the people of the world know and understand us, it is equally important for us to understand the people of the world, their culture and their problems. The Peace Corps merits the open and full support of the Congress,

not only as a means for enhancing our image abroad, but also in turn, because upon their return these young people can inform us realistically from their experience of the true needs, hopes and aspirations of the people with whom they have lived and worked in a joint effort for the betterment of man.

I have every confidence that this program, under their very able and dedicated director, R. Sargent Shriver, will be a most valuable asset to the foreign policy of our Nation.

I highly recommend this editorial from the August 30 issue of the Washington Post to all my colleagues. As the editor succinctly and persuasively states, we stand to gain a great deal should the Peace Corps succeed.

CORPS OF HOPE

Despite the earlier grumbling about its dangerous idealism, the Peace Corps seems to be doing fairly well, thank you. The other day the Senate by a voice vote passed the legislation which made the new agency permanent. Even Republican Minority Leader EVERETT DIRKSEN, who could not exactly be termed an upward and onward type, observed in the Senate that there was some good in the idea. And now President Kennedy has greeted the 80 recruits who are ready to embark on the first missions in Africa.

Actually, there has been overall a warm popular response to the Peace Corps. Even those who are skeptical about the practicability of the Corps admit that it is a good idea worth trying out. The appeal of the Peace Corps touches deep springs in our heritage. As a nation, we prefer making bridges to making war and we take an inordinate pride in the fact that our young people are among the best advertisements of our country.

Of course, it remains to be seen whether the new Corps can fulfill its promise. Certainly R. Sargent Shriver, the Director, has gone into the job with kinetic enthusiasm. The background of the first recruits holds out the hope that these youngsters will confound the stereotype of the ugly American. If successful, the Peace Corps can help to win battles that no military hardware could possibly decide. The new Corps deserves a vote of confidence in the House every bit as strong as that already given by the Senate.

We'd Better Know What We Are Going To Talk About if We Negotiate With Khrushchev

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I would like to call attention to the following article from the Wall Street Journal and issue a word of warning that the United States had better have a firm policy of strength and determination before we enter into any further negotiations with the Communists:

TALK

But what are they going to talk about? This isn't a facetious question. For plainly there are going to be talks between

the West and the Soviets over Berlin; Secretary of State Rusk says they may take place before the opening of the U.N. General Assembly in September, but in any event sometime during the fall. And equally plainly, if men are going to negotiate on any issue they have to know what there is to negotiate.

West German Foreign Minister Von Brentano, says that the talks are urgently needed to make clear the positions of both sides, East and West. At best, this is an incomplete statement of the task. The Russian position is certainly clear enough: West Berlin is a bone in Mr. Khrushchev's throat, and he wants to pluck it out. The Western position is that we will not surrender in that place to another aggression by the Communist empire—or, at least, that is the West's position if the words of its statesmen mean anything.

The British equally skirt the issue, or so it seems to us, when they say the purpose of the talks is to avoid a war over Berlin. The avoidance of war is indeed a prime task of statesmen, but if the avoidance of war were their only task then it would be simple. War can always be avoided by yielding to an aggressor; if Hitler had been yielded to at every point there would have been no World War II. There will certainly be no war over Berlin if Mr. Khrushchev negotiates the whole of it.

So, we come back, then, to the deadly serious question: What is it that, in these talks, we intend to negotiate?

Mr. Khrushchev says he is going to sign a treaty with the East Germans and that this will give their puppet government jurisdiction over all the access routes to West Berlin. Perhaps, as some people have argued, the East German Government would then be willing to sign an agreement with the West reaffirming our routes of entry. Are we prepared to accept this "quid" when the "quo" would be the acceptance of the East German Government as a separate, sovereign entity—and therefore the recognition of a permanently divided Germany?

There has been much talk about making West Berlin a free city. This was proposed by Mr. Khrushchev and seconded, though in different words, by some Members of our Congress. Is this an acceptable proposal to men who remember Danzig? And if it is to be talked about, does it mean that the West withdraws its troops from West Berlin while the Communists keep their tanks in East Berlin just across the Brandenburg gate?

In this phrase "free city" there is a yawning trap of words unless we know precisely what we are talking about, and what the Communists are talking about. Its allure is in the promise that it will preserve all those rights of the West Berliners for access to West Germany. Its snare is that making it a denationalized city would cut it off from West Germany and leave it prey in fact to the communism which surrounds it.

All these points of negotiation have one thing in common. They would make the city of West Berlin, which is now free in the true sense of the word, less free than it was before. Therefore the Communists stand to gain from any negotiated changes in the forms and technicalities. And the Communists know it—whether we do or not.

For negotiation to have any real meaning it would have to embrace also changes in the encircling communism in East Berlin and East Germany. But this is what, so far, the West is not agreed to insist upon. And it is, of course, precisely what the Soviets refuse to negotiate.

The truth is that we have a Berlin crisis today only because the Communists want to swallow the prey. Until that changes, every time the statesmen of the West sit down to talk with the men from the Kremlin the question will abide: What are they going to talk about?

Award to Congressman Brooks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 29, 1961

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, OVERTON BROOKS, of Louisiana, has been the recipient of an unusual honor. He has been cited as Congressman of the Year in Science, an award which he richly deserves and which he earned by his efforts to promote the cause of science to the betterment of this country and the free world. It is fitting that Congressman BROOKS, as the chairman of the only committee in Congress with general jurisdiction over science, should receive this award.

The award was presented to Mr. BROOKS by Western Aviation, Missiles and Space magazine, the second oldest publication in the country devoted to aerospace sciences. The presentation was made by Mr. Maurice A. Kimball, of Los Angeles, the president and publisher of this highly respected trade journal.

We, the members of his Committee on Science and Astronautics, are indeed happy that our colleague has received this great honor and I am sure that all Members of the House join with me in congratulating him upon his receiving this award and wishing him a speedy recovery from the major operation which he recently underwent at the Bethesda Naval Hospital.

We all look forward to seeing our colleague back at the Capitol soon, leading his committee to bigger and brighter horizons.

As part of my remarks, I would like to include the text of the award, which follows:

AWARD OF CONGRESSMAN OF THE YEAR IN SCIENCE, 1961, TO HON. OVERTON BROOKS, OF LOUISIANA, AUGUST 30, 1961

Western Aviation, Missiles and Space magazine takes honor in awarding to the Honorable OVERTON BROOKS, Congressman from Louisiana and chairman of the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the U.S. House of Representatives, its 1961 award as Congressman of the Year in Science.

Mr. BROOKS has been foremost in Congress in promoting the cause of science in the United States and in the free world. For his work in this field the Nation owes him a great debt.

He has labored unceasingly to bring to the attention of the Congress and the public the achievements and the needs of American science.

As chairman of the sole committee in Congress with broad legislative jurisdiction over science, he has furnished to distinguished spokesmen of many scientific disciplines an important forum through which they could bring to the attention of the American public and the world their views, their plans and their hopes for a better, more peaceful world.

Acting under his guidance, his committee has conducted numerous public hearings and studies on research and development in many fields. The following subjects, while not complete, indicate the wide range of the committee's interest: Air Force, Navy, and Army missile and space research; Depart-

ment of Defense research and engineering program; agriculture, ground effect machines; saline water; chemical, biological and radiological warfare; oceanographic research; dissemination of scientific information; hydrofoils; mechanical translation; boron high energy fuels; inflatable aircraft; scientific and professional education in the United States and abroad; the effect of noise on man and machine; space propulsion technology; mobile sea launch capability; and inflatable structures in space.

Mr. Brooks has also recognized in a unique manner the important role that science plays in today's world by appointing a Panel on Science and Technology to meet periodically with the committee to review scientific problems. The panel is composed of 14 scientists, engineers and educators who have distinguished themselves in the fields of biophysics, physics, applied mechanics, meteorology, chemistry, zoology, geophysics, physical geography, aeronautical engineering, astronomy and jet propulsion.

For his diligence, for his perseverance, for his unremitting efforts on behalf of science, Western Aviation, Missiles and Space magazine takes pride in naming the Honorable OVERTON BROOKS the Congressman of the Year in Science.

SS "Hope"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, my enthusiasm for project Hope is well known among my colleagues so it was with particular pride that I learned several months ago John C. Rawling, M.D., a prominent physician of Flint, Mich., had been selected to serve aboard the SS *Hope* at Saigon.

I have been fascinated by Dr. Rawling's letters describing life aboard the hospital ship and his impressions of this humanitarian program to help our fellow man. Recently, I received a letter of such general interest from him that I would like to call it to the attention of my colleagues in the House. It is with much pleasure that I share Dr. Rawling's comments, relating the impact of this worthy project, written earlier this month as he was preparing to return to the United States:

SS "HOPE,"

THE PEOPLE TO PEOPLE

HEALTH FOUNDATION, INC.,

Saigon, Vietnam, August 10, 1961.

Congressman CHARLES CHAMBERLAIN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CHUCK: Within a few days I shall be on my way home, so I have virtually retired from the operating suite and have more time for tourism and reflection.

Some months ago I considered the advanced skills of medicine in the United States and the ability via the Project Hope to convey these things to our confreres in other lands. As a result, I volunteered to contribute what I could to this cause.

During my first week in Saigon I visited the local hospitals which, with few exceptions, are managed by the Minister of Health or the Department of Defense. I was impressed that the physicians with whom I became acquainted were well read and capable,

but equipment and trained nursing and laboratory personnel were far behind. To try to find the reason for equipment and drug deficiencies is like searching for the answers that are a part of any bureaucracy.

The local doctors have been hospitable and at all times delighted to have us as consultants in their hospitals. I have had the privilege of performing surgery in their operating rooms and to talk about medicine for hours during their working day. I believe the same exchange between the nurses and laboratory personnel has been the greatest contribution of the Project Hope.

I was surprised one day when one of my friends at a local hospital told me how happy the patients were to see the *Hope* doctors from the United States. "They are pleased," he said, "that the United States sends us something besides guns and bullets."

In other ways we find balance and counterbalance. There were many thousands of applications for treatment aboard the ship, the needs of which are impossible to satisfy. As a result, many have been disillusioned because we cannot care for active and contagious diseases, such as tuberculosis. On the other hand, the patients with startling deformities and disabilities that were corrected will be lifelong examples of true human charity of which I am proud to be a part.

The opinion of many people in America is that perfect results in medical care is a birthright and anything less is grounds for legal action or Government control. Consider the Vietnamese, about 5 feet tall, weighing 75-100 pounds, living for years on a diet less than adequate in calories, vitamins, and minerals and frequently weakened by parasites. They do not heal or react to the stress of surgery like the average American citizen.

For this problem there is no magic solution. Elevation of living standards is the result of prosperity and peace which is not in the foreseeable future for this area. Survival, in a country which is fighting a full-scale civil war, seems more important than sound economy. And yet, I wonder if an attempt to unleash the free enterprise system of democracy might be a better weapon against socialism and communism.

I look back now on my experience with the Project Hope with the reassuring thoughts that the basic philosophical concept of this ship is as true and effective as I originally believed. I have though sometimes of the words of the late Dr. Tom Dooley, "I believe that easy and condescending charity will destroy an individual's, and even a nation's, pride and self-respect." Exchange of friendship and knowledge enriches our lives. The free donation of even medical equipment is difficult to do gracefully. One cannot avoid some resentment, in that, we have the wealth to give.

If another opportunity on a people-to-people basis should be available to me, I shall probably respond like the old fire horse when the bell rings.

Yours sincerely,

JOHN C. RAWLING, M.D.

Danger in Negotiations With Khrushchev

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I would like to include the following pertinent column by William S. White which was

printed in the Washington Evening Star. Once again the free world is faced with the alternative of risking war with the Communists or negotiating with them on issues which are not negotiable and thus give away more of our freedom. This is indeed a time of grave decision. For myself, I believe we cannot appease the Communists any longer. We cannot buy peace at the price of liberty. If we are to hold discussion on Berlin they should be direct and to the point, give the Communists a stated time to desist in their illegal blockade of East Germany, demand unification of Germany and free determination of the kind of government they want by the German people themselves. Nothing else can be negotiated without giving another victory to Khrushchev. If he insists upon the foolhardy course upon which he has embarked and insists upon the enslavement of millions of Germans, then he alone will bear responsibility for any war which starts. Let us hope that we have the national leadership with the courage to take the only course available to us if we are to live in freedom and in honor.

The article follows:

RIGHTNESS OF BERLIN NEGOTIATION—NO WEAKNESS SEEN IN ALLIES MOTIVATION IF WE DO NOT GIVE AWAY WHAT IS OURS

For the West, for America, and for President Kennedy the hour of real crisis over Berlin is at last approaching. This is the hour when we take the fateful course of accepting negotiations with the man who alone caused it all, Nikita Khrushchev.

It is not possible to deny that the position in beleaguered Berlin offers the endless possibility of war, and that something to ease the strain is deeply needed. But it also is not possible to deny that this Western decision to take the initiative toward negotiation carries with it a clear and desperate danger that appeasement of international communism may be the ultimate consequence.

Mr. Khrushchev has given many fair words of late to Western visitors while he again tries to picture himself as just a pretty reasonable old fellow, a kind of well-meaning foxy grandpa. But on the substance of the great issue over Berlin he has not given a single inch of ground. His kind of negotiation still presumes what it did in the beginning—that what is his will remain his but that what is rightfully the West's will now be open to bargaining.

In this situation the West is damned if it does and damned if it doesn't. It risks war against an irresponsible adversary if it does not negotiate. And it risks the beginning of the end of Western solidity and determination in Europe when it does negotiate.

No one who is only a commentator—or a Senator, either, for that matter—is wise enough to say for certain that Mr. Kennedy's conclusion to negotiate is the wrong decision. It is a fact that negotiation as such is never bad—is at worst useless—so long as negotiation is accompanied by an iron resolve backed by military power not to negotiate away what is ours by right. That is, we ought not to fear negotiation simply as negotiation.

Moreover, those who will easily denounce this course should remember one thing: It is easier to talk of tough lines, of yielding no concession whatever, the farther one is removed from that place of awesome responsibility which is held by the leaders of the West.

But, equally, no one at all—not even the Western leaders themselves—is able to say

with certainty that this agreement among the West to go to Mr. Khrushchev is either wise or right. It may well convince him—and this is a crucial point—that we are not willing to fight in any circumstances. It may well convince him, as Hitler was convinced a decade and more ago, that he has only to go on demanding and that we will retreat and retreat again.

What this correspondent is saying, as one observer here, is that he does not even pretend to know exactly what ought to be done and when and how. He does believe, however, that at least some things are entirely plain. Surely we ought, at minimum, to find ways of restating in the strongest possible way that there will be a point at which we will fight, if fight we must.

Surely all Americans—or rather some Americans—ought to stop acting as though this were just a dispute between two more or less equal antagonists. This is not a case in which there are wrongs on both sides. There is in simple fact no wrong on our side, and there is no right on Mr. Khrushchev's side.

It was not the West which opened this threat to all mankind over Berlin; it was Mr. Khrushchev. It is not the West which is trying to destroy anybody's rights; it is Mr. Khrushchev. And in allowing itself to be in the position of seeking negotiations at this stage, the West's motivating force will not be seen as weakness—so long as we don't give away what cannot honorably ever be given away. This is the right of the West to stay in Berlin and to maintain full access to it.

This is the whole nature of the twilight hour which now draws near, along with autumn, in Washington: We have the world firmly to save, whatever the cost, or meanly to lose, whatever the motive.

Rally Behind Dirksen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I am pleased to pay tribute to the distinguished Senator from Illinois, the minority leader in the U.S. Senate, EVERETT M. DIRKSEN. As a Member of both this House and also the other body for more than a quarter of a century he has commanded the respect of his colleagues on both sides of the aisle. Senator DIRKSEN was only a very young man in his early thirties when he first came to the Congress. This was indeed a fortunate circumstance for the country for the reason that despite his long and valuable experience as a legislator, he remains available at this critical hour in our Nation's history to continue to lead his party in the Chamber where he now serves during the years that still lie ahead. This he will do with the same imaginative vigor and resourcefulness that have led him to his present position of leadership.

Mr. Speaker, our country sorely needs the continued service of experienced, dedicated men like the junior Senator from Illinois. A grateful party, indeed, a grateful constituency that embraces people from both political parties, will

eagerly support him as he continues to serve the people of his State and our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to incorporate in my remarks at this point the editorial opinion of the two largest newspapers published in the district that I am proud to represent, the Rockford Register-Republic and the Rockford Morning Star:

[From the Rockford (Ill.) Register-Republic, Aug. 11, 1961]

RALLY BEHIND DIRKSEN

Illinois Republicans will push their party off to a strong start in the 1962 congressional election race by getting solidly behind the candidacy for reelection of Senator EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, Senate minority leader and stalwart spokesman for solid Republicanism.

Republicans in this State, by closing ranks now and avoiding an intraparty fight for the senatorial nomination next April, will strengthen their position in the campaign for 24 seats in the House of Representatives, which might be decided on a statewide, at-large basis.

A squabble over the U.S. Senate nomination would be costly to the Illinois Republican Party in a crucial election year. DIRKSEN, on the basis of his outstanding record—he served eight terms in the House and is completing his second Senate term—should have a clear path to the nomination. Then Republicans could bring all their guns to bear upon contests for the U.S. House of Representatives.

Republican central committees in Winnebago and other northern Illinois counties, which consistently bulwark the GOP vote in this State, should take the lead by declaring themselves united for Senator DIRKSEN. Once started, this movement could spread through other Republican county organizations in Illinois and result in DIRKSEN's nomination by acclamation.

Although the Register-Republic favors open primaries under normal political conditions, there is too much at stake in next year's primary for the Republican Party to engage in a senatorial nomination fight which could leave deep wounds, waste energy, and give the Chicago Democratic machine unnecessary advantage in the November 1962 election. Chicago Mayor Daley would welcome a bitter Republican fight for the senatorial nomination. Daley has indicated he would support Illinois House Speaker Paul Powell of Vienna for the Democratic senatorial bid, Illinois doesn't want another Daley-picked U.S. Senator, joining PAUL DOUGLAS, whose claim to represent all Illinois is a myth.

Illinois Republicans must recognize that their party needs solid downstate support, along with maximum possible Republican support in Cook County, to elect a candidate in a statewide race. The 1962 races for Congress give Republicans throughout the country opportunity to increase their party's Senate strength, possibly to win House control. The minority party generally picks up seats in off-year elections; thus, 1962 is not the time for any divisive, rank-shattering campaigns.

Senator DIRKSEN, spared of the necessity of waging a fight for renomination, could devote full energy to leading the Illinois Republican drive for Congress. His skill as a campaigner would then be available to the entire Republican ticket. It is of urgent importance that Illinois Republicans look ahead now to 1962, assure Senator DIRKSEN an unopposed primary place, and concentrate upon congressional races. A substantial gain by Republicans next year will strengthen the GOP's hand in the 1964 presidential race.

[From the Rockford (Ill.) Morning Star Aug. 8, 1961]

LET SOLID GOP BACK DIRKSEN

Illinois Republicans, looking for a rallying and unifying point in the 1962 election, have one at hand in the candidacy of Senator EVERETT M. DIRKSEN for another term in the U.S. Senate.

And it is not too early to be considering tactics for a campaign of vast importance in the makeup of the next Congress, and of equally great importance in planning for the 1964 presidential race.

Senator DIRKSEN's reelection is an essential step in the achievement of Republican leadership in Illinois, and it should be assured by a rallying to his support well before the primaries next spring.

The Democrats would like nothing better than a Republican Donnybrook in the senatorial primary next spring, for they believe cleavages could be opened that could not be healed by fall; divisions between Chicago and downstate Republicanism could be deepened; and a lot of campaign energy and money that should go to the fall election would be expended to no end save division.

Illinois has found Senator DIRKSEN an able and militant spokesman for Republicanism. He deserves another term. His skill and intelligence are needed in the Senate, where it is not likely the Republicans will be able to achieve a majority in 1962.

So any ambitious Republicans who might consider themselves worthy competitors for Senator DIRKSEN's toga should invite themselves out. Let them give their energy to the Dirksen campaign and to the House campaigns, which may see at-large races for 25 seats. Next April's senatorial primary is not a proper stage for political adventuring and maneuvering. This newspaper, under ordinary circumstances, likes to speak for open primaries. But the coming Senate primary is not an ordinary circumstance; the stakes are too high, and the quality of the incumbent Republican is such that he ought to be given a clear track.

For Illinois ought not to take the risk of a divided Republican Party, with its ammunition expended in an intraparty fight, getting us another Paul—a Paul Powell of Vienna to be added to a Paul Douglas of Chicago—and leaving Illinois with no GOP representative in the Senate until 1966 at the earliest. Nor would either of the two Democratic Pauls be representative of this State, leaving party out of it.

There is a forthright and effective way to assure Senator DIRKSEN what would be tantamount to an acclamation nomination in the primary. Let each Republican county organization declare at the earliest possible date this fall that it will support DIRKSEN in the April primary. Our own Winnebago County Republican Central Committee should take the lead. With county organizations on record for DIRKSEN, no merely venturesome contender is likely to enter the race.

Some county chairmen may argue that they are committed to open primaries—cannot take a stand for a single candidate, no matter what his stature. But let them ask themselves these questions:

Does DIRKSEN, on his record, his ability, his importance to State and National Republicanism, deserve another term? Clearly he does. Then should not the path to reelection be made as open as possible?

Under existing circumstances, when Republicanism is underdog, is it wise to demand of a candidate the party wants that he go through a harassing and costly open primary merely to maintain the fiction that county organizations keep their hands off the primary?

Will the Republican Party not be stronger if DIRKSEN's unchallenged skill as a cam-

paigner is utilized for the whole party, as it will be if he is freed of the necessity of going through an exhausting primary fight? And is not this enlisting of DIRKSEN's campaigning skill not doubly important with the possibility that representatives in Congress may be nominated at large next April?

The need for unity and unified purpose has never been greater in Illinois Republican history.

This newspaper proposes that the Winnebago County Republican Central Committee, and like committees throughout this area, take the lead in declaring promptly their support of DIRKSEN in the primary, and make clear to any prospective contenders where they stand and their total lack of enthusiasm for boat rockers in a critical campaign.

Address by Mr. Walter J. Brown

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include the following address which was made on July 17, 1961, at the Ocean Forest Hotel in Myrtle Beach, S.C., where the South Carolina Broadcasters Association held its summer convention. The address was delivered by Mr. Walter J. Brown, president, Spartan Radiocasting Co.—WSPA-AM-FM-TV—Spartanburg, S.C. Mr. Brown is an outstanding figure in the field of radio and television communications and I salute this address and wish to include its text in the Appendix of the RECORD:

KEYNOTE ADDRESS DELIVERED BY WALTER J. BROWN, AT SOUTH CAROLINA BROADCASTERS ASSOCIATION, SUMMER CONVENTION, JULY 17, 1961, OCEAN FOREST HOTEL, MYRTLE BEACH, S.C.

Distinguished guests and fellow broadcasters: It was a high honor to be asked to be your keynote speaker at our summer convention. I accepted the invitation with a certain amount of trepidation because I realized the severity of competition for the thoughts of men at the seashore in the summertime. My father, who was a Georgia politician of some renown, was brought up in the old school before electronic devices, and he had to depend entirely on his own voice power to reach his listeners. As a boy, I remember him saying: "I will speak at a county fair provided I am isolated, but I absolutely refuse to speak if forced to compete with a flying Jenny."

Competing at the seashore is even more difficult, but I hope we are sufficiently isolated this morning to do a little serious thinking on the problems and opportunities that are ours as broadcasters in this exciting and critical era of the sixties.

First of all, let me say that one of the most effective avenues of assistance to help us seize our opportunities and deal with our problems is a strong State Association of Broadcasters. We must not only support our association with our dues but with our time.

Never before has there been such a need for a strong State association. An example is our effort to wipe out tax discrimination against broadcasting stations. I hope you will hear the report by Dudley Saumening at this convention, and let's resolve to take

this issue into the 1962 campaign on both the local and State level if this discrimination is not eliminated by the legislature at the next session.

Another example of why it is imperative we have a strong State association is that our way of life in South Carolina and the South is under attack. We are operating broadcasting stations which most every day are broadcasting news and programs from national networks which are slanted against the South. We cannot monitor every newscast, but we can insist that our networks not distort the news or lose its balance of fairness.

In the months ahead I am afraid our problems in this field will become more serious. South Carolina and the South have a side in this controversy, and as broadcasters, we should do what we can to see that it is fairly presented to the public.

I hope broadcasters of South Carolina will band together with other southern State associations and work to convince the networks and the news services that they should not be overinfluenced by these minority blocs who are being pampered as they peddle their vendettas against the South.

Broadcasting must remain free—free from coercion by pressure groups and free from destructive Government regulation.

If we should ever destroy our system of free broadcasting in America, we would be far down the road to a totalitarian state. We must never cease our efforts to assure for broadcasting the same freedom which is enjoyed by the press.

But we cannot go about muttering platitudes about free broadcasting unless we as broadcasters are willing and do assume the responsibility which goes with such freedom.

William S. Paley hit the nail on the head when he recently said:

"This problem of freedom and responsibility can be stated in pretty simple terms: This medium is too powerful, too persuasive, too important not to have the safeguards of the same freedom that, as a free society, we have insisted upon for the press. That freedom presupposes, in us as broadcasters, a clear sense of responsibility. If we fail to see the dimensions of that responsibility and to measure up to them, we are in for constant threats of restrictions and policing."

Now, how do we assume that responsibility?

First of all, I think that every radio station and every television station should subscribe to the NAB codes. They provide what I consider the minimum standards of responsibility. We as broadcasters can and should go further. Many of us do and were so doing before this recent hue and cry broke out against broadcasting.

It is nothing new for broadcasters to give free time for political candidates. Our radio station has been broadcasting without charge for 20 years the joint debates which are held under our political system in South Carolina. Ever since our television station has been on the air, we have devoted free time to all candidates. Other broadcasters have done likewise, and I am sure broadcasters as a whole have lost no opportunity to carry programs designed to contribute to an informed electorate and to get out the vote.

Broadcasters also have given freely of their time in presenting programs and public service messages which have permitted almost every facet of our free society to get its message before the people.

As we read some of the speeches coming out of Washington and comment in the newspapers and magazines, one would think that all broadcasters have done is sit in their office and count their money. Some would have it appear we have been oblivious to anything that would contribute to the public interest and to the education, civic advancement, and the religious inspiration of the

people it is our privilege to serve. We all know the absolute contrary is the truth.

What we are witnessing today, as I see it, is a concerted effort to crucify the many for the sins of the few.

Certainly, there have been some broadcasters who have looked upon a radio or television station as a counting house to the exclusion of public service.

Certainly, there have been broadcasters who have delegated their responsibilities to others and permitted producers and talent to do things which should not have been done.

Certainly, there have been programs not in good taste so far as children or even adults were concerned.

But I maintain these are the exceptions.

Regardless of how noble our motives may be, however, and how much we desire our stations to serve the public interest to the maximum degree, we must have a successful economic base to operate from before we can do an effective job.

A lot of people have the idea that if you own a broadcasting station all you've got to do is turn on the power and the money comes rolling in. There is money to be made in broadcasting today, to be sure; however, I think some of the dogooders who are now finding so much fault with radio and television should realize this license to broadcast is not like having an oil well presented to us where we only have to turn a switch and reap excessive profits. Especially is this true in the smaller cities which are the very backbone of American broadcasting. Our economic problem has become more acute as a result of increased competition from more stations and increased operating costs. Network affiliated stations find our own networks competing with us for national spot business by selling minute announcements on both radio and television networks. If the networks do not restrict their activity in this field, they may kill the goose that laid the golden egg.

There is no more competitive business in America today than radio broadcasting, and in most markets this applies to television. While broadcasting has become more competitive, our newspaper critics and competitors have become more monopolistic. One has to look hard in America today to find a competitive newspaper city. Take Atlanta, as an example, a city of a million people. The only two newspapers there have common ownership and I might add absentee ownership. In every major city in South Carolina the newspapers are under common ownership. In all these cities there are competitive broadcasting stations.

Everyone agrees broadcasting fills the need for broader news coverage. It also can fill the vacuum for more editorial points of view. Because broadcasting is competitive and not monopolistic as are most newspapers, I think editorializing is one of our greatest untapped opportunities to contribute to good government and a virile democracy. On the other hand, I cannot think of any more terrible fate that could befall any broadcasting station and the city or area it serves than irresponsible editorializing.

Canned editorials are not the answer as I see it. I think the owner or the management must either personally direct the editorial policies of the station and write their own editorials or be in a position to hire competent people to produce the station's editorials under clearly defined policies. If this can be done and broadcasting assume its full editorial responsibility, we will have vastly increased the scope of editorial comment in this country. This will be a tremendous public service. It will take courage, it will take perseverance and it will take economic strength for stations to properly editorialize. But it will elevate broadcasting as a profession and enable stations to

make an even greater contribution to our society and our democracy.

When broadcasters do exercise their right to editorialize, then it is to be hoped that the Commission and those in power in Washington will stand by the broadcasters and not force them to employ legal counsel in Washington every time some special pressure groups take exceptions to the editorial viewpoint expressed by the broadcaster. A broadcasting station must have the same protection as a newspaper and in editorializing we cannot be subjected to intimidation because we operate under a Federal license.

Broadcasters who editorialize must see to it that any opposing view is given a right to express itself; but when this is done, broadcasters should not be punished, harassed, or harangued because they have taken an editorial stand unpopular with one group or clique or faction.

Broadcasting, and especially television, today is being blamed for almost all ills of our society from the womb to the tomb. We are being blamed for juvenile delinquency, alcoholism, free love and most every problem that has confronted mankind since Adam ate the forbidden fruit. And here again, all we hear is the bad about television and little about the good in television. A columnist in our local newspaper recently began his column like this:

"Look in your living room or den this very minute and you'll probably see the most expensive excuse this country has ever had for sin."

"Yep. It's that one-eyed television set. The same that shows Cartoon Carnival, Captain Kangaroo, and Sunset Strip."

"Its convenience probably is one reason why television has become the national scapegoat. After all, everyone has one."

This columnist interviewed our probation office and our sheriff, a former FBI agent, and they said television in their opinion had not contributed to juvenile delinquency and crime.

As a boy, I can remember that juvenile delinquency was blamed on the movies, the funny papers and the magazines. Prohibition and various other factors were given as the cause for crime and wayward children. What was true then is true now. Children become delinquent because they have not had good training in the home and have not been properly controlled and disciplined. When there was no television, children were delinquent. And when we reach the moon, we will still have juvenile delinquency and we will still have crime.

And speaking of the moon, I wonder how many of you have read Joseph Klapper's book on the "Effects of Mass Communication." As my young son would say—it is "way out," but I think it is good reading for those of us associated with mass communication.

Klapper, in his chapter on the effect of radio and television on children, reminds his readers that only a few years ago the educators and teachers were appealing to broadcasters to cease broadcasting programs about space ships and rockets to the moon. They then said it was terrible to fill a child's mind with all this make-believe stuff and getting him away from reality.

I wonder if these educators remembered their criticism when we broadcast Commander Shepard's flight into space.

For every one kid who may have been influenced adversely by what he saw on television or heard on radio, I believe 1,000 kids have benefited by television and radio in becoming better informed, better educated and more closely knitted to the family circle.

How silly can we get when a Congressman stands on the floor of the House of Representatives and says when his aunt recently died and when his wife broke the news to his 7-year-old boy, he asked: "Who shot her?"

I do not say that we have not had too many Westerners or too many whodunits or too many private eye programs on television. But I do say I have never seen any research or any findings that caused me to believe that broadcasting has been a substantial contributing factor to juvenile delinquency.

When I hear some of the talk about Westerns, I think of my boyhood in Georgia, I sold papers to get my spending money, and much of it went for picture shows. I did not go breaking down the doors of our picture show hall to see Macbeth or Romeo and Juliet. The guy I was most interested in seeing was William S. Hart. I shall never forget his ability to strike a match with his thumbnail and also his masterful handling of a Smith and Wesson. Those Western pictures showed the type of two-fisted Americanism that developed the West and made this Nation great. As a boy I saw a lot of Westerns and there was plenty of shooting but they did not cause me to ask my mother when her sister died, "Who shot Aunt Cora?"

Why do they not talk about what radio and television have meant to people who seldom had an opportunity to see or hear a big league baseball game or enjoy a Broadway play or any worthwhile entertainment. My hometown in Georgia was isolated from the world. Now, that town has a window on the world. As a boy I drove in a horse and buggy with my father 12 miles to see a man fly an airplane. My son sat in our living room and saw Commander Shepard rocketed into space. All of this in one generation. Broadcasting is in its infancy. Sure, mistakes have been made, but I say there is no group of people more anxious to correct these mistakes than are the broadcasters themselves. And what is more, we are correcting them.

Think of the early day of journalism. As many of you know, I came into broadcasting from the newspaper field. Newspapers were established and for a long time enjoyed the privilege of a free press purely to promote one political thought or one political candidate. There was sensational journalism and yellow journalism to increase circulation.

The newspapers have made tremendous strides but still there are some which feature sex and crime to sell papers. It took the newspapers 150 years to assume the responsibility which goes with a free press. I say that within less than 50 years the broadcasters of America are assuming their responsibility under free broadcasting much more quickly than did the newspapers.

Then why all this wrath from the newspapers and magazines against broadcasting? Could the reason be they want to cripple broadcasting and get back the advertising dollars they have lost to a new competing media?

We are told the airways belong to the people. Some used to think that the primary function of Government in broadcasting was to be a traffic cop of the airways to prevent interference. The degree Government should go in regulating broadcasting is, of course, debatable. Certainly, the FCC should see to it that broadcasters live up to their commitments in securing their licenses. The Commission must discharge its responsibility to seeing to it that stations operate in the public interest—a mandate in the Communications Act which is subjected to wide and varied interpretations. As the Commission interprets the meaning of "public interest," we can expect change.

The extent to which the FCC in the public interest should project itself into programming, however, and not become censors is the important question free broadcasting faces today.

I am sure no present member of the Commission wants to establish censorship and usurp the program prerogatives of broadcasters. But I have had experience in Washington both in Government and as a newspaper-

man. Whatever power the Commission may adopt over programming will not be exercised by the members of the Commission but by lesser people in Government, many of whom will crave the power to have a hand in programming to promote their own political or sociological ideas.

As assistant to the Director of War Mobilization during World War II, I saw these type people operating. At times I thought they were more interested in grasping power to promote their own pet theory of government than in winning the war.

Here again, what I am talking about is the exception and not the rule, but what we as broadcasters, what the Commission and what the Congress must be eternally on guard against is the camel getting his nose under the tent and wrecking the covering protection of free broadcasting.

Broadcasters realize the airways belong to the people, but no station can please all of the people all the time. If in our programming we do not try to please most of the people most of the time, we will soon go out of business.

To please most of the people most of the time does not mean that we cannot have program balance, that we cannot devote a good percentage of our broadcast week to programs which we know have a small but important audience. An audience small in number is often important in stature.

And this brings me to the numbers game in broadcasting.

I do not believe we have a reliable rating service because the samples are too small and the margin for error too great.

The decision of the rating companies to undertake to tell an advertiser how many homes were viewing or hearing a particular program every 15 minutes in the day was a disservice to broadcasting and, I believe, is largely responsible for many of our ills. In the first place, it cannot be done accurately on such a small sample, and secondly, there is no more justification to attempt to provide quarter hour circulation than for newspapers or magazines to establish the number of people who read each page in the newspaper or the magazine rather than their gross circulation.

It is almost a crime the way broadcast time is bought today. A time buyer in a little partitioned office picks up a book, takes the number of homes delivered at a particular time and feeds that together with the station rate into a Monroe calculating machine. Out jumps the cost per thousand. The station with the lowest cost per thousand gets the business. They call this on Madison Avenue, "The Monroe Doctrine."

We hear a lot about a station image. Time buyers care nothing about this. They give no credit to a station for being a code station. They seldom make any qualitative analysis to determine the type income bracket or location of those listening to or viewing a station.

You cannot blame the time buyers. They have to justify their buy to the media director and, unfortunately, the only criteria of justification they know is numbers.

I do not see why broadcasters can't be as smart as newspaper publishers and set up their own bureau of circulation. Such a bureau of circulation would have to be headed by competent people, and it would have to have the confidence of the advertiser. If there was only one circulation source, as newspapers have, the audit could cover sufficient homes to be reliable and accurate. As has been suggested, we need a lot of research on this subject, and I fully realize that the solution of this rating problem is not an easy one. But I am firmly convinced unless there is a new system for buying broadcast time in this country, we will never stabilize broadcasting, and we shall continue to live in a jungle of rating warfare which is not healthy for broadcasting.

The solution of our rating or circulation problem would, in my opinion, serve to upgrade our programming, but this would not satisfy those who are now howling at the heels of broadcasters. The intellectuals, so called, are having a Roman holiday in their criticism of broadcasting. They want us to program for the few instead of the many. Since the people themselves own the airways, should not our objective be to satisfy the greatest number of people keeping in mind, of course, the need for balance in our program structure and presenting a fair percentage of these programs strictly designed to inform, educate and to uplift the cultural standards of our listeners and viewers?

Television and radio alone cannot raise the cultural level of our people. Certainly, we can help and we are helping. We are not downgrading culture as our critics suggest. Max Wylie recently pointed out that:

"In the 66 years from 1895 to now, the top 15 bestsellers included 3 inspirational books, 2 cookbooks, 1 book on baby care and 9 novels. The baby book, of course, is the one that you know, Dr. Sprock. You're familiar with two of the inspirational books, Dale Carnegie's 'How to Win Friends,' and Charles Sheldon's 'In His Steps.' Of the novels, 'God's Little Acre,' by Erskine Caldwell was a dirty book, 'Peyton's Place' was a dirty book. Those are two of the nine. The remaining seven novels among the best-sellers of the past 66 years were all written by the same man—and his name is Mickey Spillane."

"Television critics hate to have to take this unhappy truth into account," Mr. Wylie said, as they blame broadcasters for not putting more intellectual programs on the air.

Broadcasting has many functions to perform. Certainly, it must educate. It must promote religious inspiration. It must provide a forum for discussion of public questions. It must serve as a news medium and, most important, it must entertain. We are doing all these. No one claims the perfect balance has been found, but we are making progress and will continue to make progress if broadcasting is not put in a bureaucratic strait jacket, and we can maintain economic stability.

What concerns me about the present climate in which broadcasting now finds itself is that it has become apparently smart in elite circles to criticize and belittle the American system of broadcasting because our programming does not measure up to their highly refined expectations.

What is good broadcasting to some is stupid broadcasting to others. A station cannot be all highbrow or all low brow. As Bob Sarnoff points out so vividly in his recent article in the Saturday Evening Post, television can feed an increasingly number of cultural and cerebral programs and as a result promote a general upgrading of viewing habits. However, if radio or television should start programming their stations to satisfy the intellectual top 10 percent of the audience, we would soon find a broadcasting blackout in 90 percent of the homes.

I have always said that programming a radio or television station is like providing a balanced diet for the human body. We must have ham and eggs, grits and some pinto beans in our diet. Also, we must have some spinach, but we cannot make broadcasting strictly vegetarian and hold our audience.

As broadcasters we must strive at all times to upgrade our programming. But we cannot upgrade our programming faster than the American people to choose to upgrade their cultural and intellectual standards.

Radio and television programming is changing all the time, and I believe for the best. This has been true since the inception of radio because if we do not program well that little flip of the wrist comes into play, and we are dead.

I have only scratched the surface in discussing the problems and opportunities that await us as broadcasters. There are many more, and all of us have different opinions as to the best way to deal with our problems and take full advantage of our opportunities. But we all must have one objective and that is the full utilization of our opportunities to provide the best broadcasting possible.

Let us not be discouraged because we feel we are being unjustly criticized. And let us never forget that problems of today may become opportunities of tomorrow.

Not since the day I entered broadcasting have I been free of problems. It is a business that challenges your ingenuity, your stamina, and your patience. Every day in every week and almost every hour of the day we are made aware that broadcasting carries tremendous responsibility, but with it all I know of no endeavor more satisfying and more rewarding for the effort we put forth.

Despite all the fanfare of criticism being hurled our way, I am still proud to be a broadcaster and especially proud to be a South Carolina broadcaster.

**Answer to Congressman Francis Walter
in Connection With the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs**

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, in the August 24, 1961, issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, on page A5966, my colleague, FRANCIS WALTER, of Pennsylvania, inserted a letter which he mailed to the editor of the Sons of Italy in Philadelphia, answering an allegedly unfair personal attack against him by me. He refers to a letter which the Federation of the Italian-American Democratic Organizations of the State of New York, Inc., of which I am president, sent to John F. Kennedy, the President of the United States, condemning Congressman WALTER for his threat to abolish the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs in the State Department, subsequent to the President's announcement that he was going to appoint Salvatore Bontempo as Director and Michael Cieplinski as Deputy Director. Mr. WALTER invited me in his concluding sentence to answer him. Prior to Mr. WALTER's letter, I had not inserted any article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and in view of Mr. WALTER's invitation, I take this opportunity to reply to his statement and incorporate the resolution which the federation sent to our President, John F. Kennedy.

As long as Representative WALTER's name is attached to the immigration law that is currently on our books and which is known as the McCarran-Walter law, it is difficult to see how he can escape the suspicion of prejudice against certain national groups. Many of the bills that he quotes to prove his pro-Italian sympathies would be needless if we had an immigration law based on fairness instead of on national origins which dis-

criminate against immigrants from southern and eastern Europe. The national origins concept has lost its meaning in view of the lack of unimpeded access to the United States by American-born sons and daughters of Europeans who emigrated to the Western Hemisphere.

Not only does the general public dislike the McCarran-Walter law, but also do many of our colleagues, who have introduced omnibus legislation to abolish the law and to enact a law which they regard as fair and reasonable. Approximately 28 Congressmen at some time or other led by Congressman Celler, of New York, chairman of the Judiciary Committee, have introduced omnibus immigration laws designed to repeal the McCarran-Walter law.

Eastern Europe is now largely closed to us as a source of immigrants, but no European who lives in a country whose quota is filled for the next 10 years or more while thousands of unfilled quota places remain elsewhere is likely to think of Congressman WALTER as a friend and benefactor. Mr. WALTER is regarded by many as "Mr. Immigration." No legislation apparently can be enacted without his approval.

During the last presidential campaign, our President pledged to me in writing that he would espouse legislation revising the immigration law to make it more humanitarian, to reunite families, and to reallocate unused quotas. While Congressman WALTER has introduced legislation this year, meaningful immigration laws carrying out the President's program has not been forthcoming. In view of Mr. WALTER's breasting as to his accomplishments, I urge him to take action this year to carry out the President's pledge of reunification of families and reallocation of unused quotas.

I notice that while Congressman WALTER attacked the appointments of Salvatore Bontempo and Michael Cieplinski, he makes no mention of their conduct in the positions for which they were appointed. Is it possible that in the short period of time since their appointment that they have proven to be able men and that they are doing the job well? Finally, it will be much easier for Americans to stop being Italian-Americans or Polish-Americans when laws such as the McCarran-Walter immigration law are no longer in existence to remind them of their origins.

The original resolution of the Federation of the Italian-American Democratic Organizations of the State of New York, which is the basis of our controversy, is set forth, as follows:

Whereas the President of the United States has recently nominated Salvatore Bontempo as Administrator of the State Department Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs, an American of Italian ancestry from New Jersey, and Michael Cieplinski as Deputy Administrator, an American of Polish ancestry from New York, and

Whereas the appointees are qualified by reason of their background and demonstrated experience; and

Whereas Representative FRANCIS E. WALTER, of Pennsylvania, has taken unprecedented steps to prevent the appointees, Salvatore Bontempo and Michael Cieplinski, from

serving in the posts to which they have been designated by threatening to abolish the entire Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs, a Bureau of 800 which handle passports and visas and refugee problems, and also makes security checks on all State Department employees, and which was created 8 years ago by a bill coauthored by Representative WALTER; and

Whereas the aforesaid Bureau has performed and is performing valuable functions essential to the security of our Nation; the Federation of the Italian-American Democratic Organizations of the State of New York, Inc., believes that such legislation to abolish the Bureau is motivated by obvious personal prejudices and considerations rather than by the best interests of the welfare of the United States; and

Whereas, the federation believes that Representative WALTER's actions are a manifestation of discriminatory attitudes toward nationality groups, particularly against peoples of the Mediterranean area and Slavic countries as demonstrated in the provisions of the biased Walter-McCarran Immigration Act: Now, therefore, it is

Resolved, That the federation protests and condemns the attempted rebuke of the President of the United States through the methods of Congressman WALTER's proposed legislation to abolish the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs subsequent to the President's nominations; and it is further

Resolved, That the federation condemns the attitude and conduct of Representative FRANCIS E. WALTER in seeking to abolish the State Department's Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs to which Salvatore Bontempo and Michael Cieplinski have been nominated by the President of the United States to serve.

A Freedom Rider Quits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 21, 1961

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I am impressed by the fine editorial contribution of the Lakeland Ledger appearing in the issue for Thursday, June 8, 1961, and I submit it for reprinting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

A FREEDOM RIDER QUILTS

One of the so-called freedom riders has quit in disgust. He became disillusioned when he got to know more about his fellow freedom riders.

He is a white minister from Chicago, a Baptist who conducts a mission there and has worked for years with Negro delinquents on Chicago's Southside.

He said he was shocked when he discovered the background of some of his companions of the freedom ride through Alabama and Mississippi.

He was shocked, he said, to learn their attitudes toward communism and atheism, and to learn that some of them had police records.

"I had expected a high type of people," he said. "I am disappointed with their caliber. I will not knowingly associate with any questionable group."

Part of his disillusionment came when he learned that one of the freedom riders had been arrested for thefts, that another had served 5 months for being absent without leave from Fort Dix, N.J., and that another "believes there is no God."